"GRASS-ROOTS" ADMINISTRATION

OF

FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

BY

ELECTED COMMITTEEMEN

3

"GRASS-ROOTS" ADMINISTRATION

OF

FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

BY

ELECTED COMMITTEEMEN

Prepared by
Gardner P. Smith
Northeast Area, CSS
July 1960

5c

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

"GRASS-ROOTS" ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FARM

PROGRAMS BY ELECTED COMMITTEEMEN

Farmer-elected committees have made an outstanding record in administering joint-action programs since 1933.

From the early days of the Corn-Hog Program to our present day complex agricultural programs, the farmer committee system has provided a close contact between the farmer and his Government. This direct relationship is considered essential to the success of joint-action farm programs. The term joint-action farm program for the purpose of this report refers to those programs where the farmer acts in partnership with the Government to control production and marketing of agricultural commodities or carries out conservation practices in return for which he receives cost-share payments or price support assistance.

Early legislation did not specify the kind of farmer organization to be used, but the idea that farmers themselves should have a part in the administration and development of their own programs gained early acceptance.

This fundamental concept has guided the entire development of the farmer-committee system.

For each joint-action farm program passed by Congress, an administrative system was needed that allowed the programs to meet State, local, and individual needs.

The committee system has proven particularly well adapted for this purpose.

Legislative origin of the committee system was contained in Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. Although committee administration under this Act was permissive, committees were generally used to accept contracts, reduce crop acreage, make farm allotments and measure crop acreages.

Later, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, directed the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the services of local, county, and State committeemen in carrying out the provisions of these Acts.

The development of the present Agricultural Conservation Program depended on the services of committeemen in all 3,000 agricultural counties. Since 1938, acreage allotments and price support activities have been administered at State and local levels by State, county, and community committees.

During World War II, State and county committee offices (at that time AAA offices) became centers of agricultural production and rationing activities. The chairman of the county AAA committee, an active farmer, was also chairman of the local USDA War Board and was usually required to spend full time on rationing and production functions. Community and county committeemen played a vital role in a host of emergency measures ranging from the distribution of information to rationing of farm machinery and cooperating in War Board drives.

In 1944 during the special "Corn-for-War Program," the committee system was chiefly responsible for closing a dangerous gap in corn deliveries.

Subsequent legislation placed additional responsibility on the farmer-committee system. The Sugar Act of 1948, the Wool Incentive Payment Program, additional price support programs, Farm Storage and Facility Loan programs, special emergency programs, and the Soil Bank Program and other programs all added to the complexity of the committeemen's job.

Administrative evolution of the committee system was coincident with growth in responsibility. At first, committee work was carried on under the direction of the Extension Service. The 1936 Act provided for community and county elections by farmers of farmer committeemen. State committeemen, also farmers, were to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Two distinct types of committee organizations evolved: one a system where State and county committees worked full time, the other where these committees acted as boards of directors.

In 1953 policy-execution and policy-making functions were separated everywhere. Most committees acted as boards of directors and day-to-day operations were carried on through office managers at the county level and administrative officers at the State level. Each committee-man was placed on part-time basis and paid for the days worked. This method has been used up to the present time; committeemen formulate policy and administrative officers and county office managers carry out the policy under the guidance of the committees.

Further administrative refinements were added from time to time. Most significant of these were State committee rotation plans, orientation and training programs, changes in election procedures, classification and pay plans for county office employees, annual comprehensive audits, and operation review procedures.

The record of committee administration of joint-action programs contains very little evidence of mal-administration or violation of regulatory laws. This fact is especially noteworthy considering the number of committeemen involved in program activity and the extensive funds handled through committee administration.

There are approximately 30,000 community committees and 3,000 county committees each with three farmer-elected committeemen. Thus about 100,000 local and county committeemen administer joint-action programs each year. Each State committee at the present time, has three farmer-members (except California and Texas which have five) appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

One of the most far-reaching programs handled by farmer committees is the Agricultural Conservation Program. This extends into every agricultural county in the United States and involves participation by more than one million farmers each year. Up to 1959, farmer committeemen had administered an accumulated total of $4,254,359,000 in conservation payments to farmers. Some notable results of this conservation effort have been the establishment of 86,977,851 acres of protective vegetative cover, 2,272,129 acres of forest trees planted, 1,235,300 livestock water structures constructed, and application of 391,379,590 tons of liming materials to improve protective cover.

Another major farm program administered through the committee system in the field is commodity price supports. Up to July 1, 1959, committeemen in administering the price support programs handled commodities with a loan value of more than 30 billion dollars. The accumulative total market value of these crops is several hundred billion dollars.

Since 1956, committees have approved 305,003 Soil Bank contracts which placed 28,432,186 acres of farm land in the Conservation Reserve. Under this program, the Government is obligated to pay farmers $411,420,909 in annual rental payments and $134,749,111 in practice payments to pay for the establishment of over 21,788,841 acres of grassland cover, and 2,159,500 acres of trees planted and other conservation practices.

These are only a few of the joint-action programs dependent on the committee system for successful execution in the field. In addition, they currently are responsible for establishing farm allotments for wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and for the Wool Incentive Payment Program, sugar control and payment program, farm commodity storage and drying facility program, and special emergency purchasing programs, and Disaster Livestock Feed Program.

Aside from the program results of committee activity, the committee system has promoted an effective means of developing agricultural leadership. There are many examples of committeemen moving up through the committee system to assume positions of leadership on State committees or in other State and national groups.

The committeemen's knowledge of local conditions helps to guarantee that Federal joint-action programs will best fit their intended use at the "grass-roots" level. The system is designed to allow committee consideration for local conditions within the framework of legislation

and administrative regulations and to permit the people affected by the programs to have a substantial part in their administration and development. Committeemen have provided a judgment factor and displayed a unique ability to make these programs work well at the local level.

Committee assistance to and cooperation with Federal agencies such as the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, and others in carrying out farm programs is a matter of record. With few exceptions, the farmer committee system has functioned smoothly in inter-agency program operations.

The programs administered through the committee system affect the welfare not only of American agriculture but of the entire Nation. They extend beyond to the welfare of foreign countries supplied with food in the cause of peace.

It has been said that the farmer committee system is symbolic of the very core of democracy; farmers themselves unify their efforts to accomplish Federal farm program objectives. The programs they administer are not designed to guarantee the farmer an income, but to guarantee the farmer an opportunity to do for himself what he could not otherwise do.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 contained the first legal authority for what later developed into the committee system. The basic purpose of this Act was to restore the farmers purchasing power to a level equal to the 1909 - 1914 base period, in other words, to attain parity. Provision was made under the Act for contracts to be signed between farmers and the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce crops or hog numbers. The Secretary of Agriculture was authorized, but not required to establish, "local committees or associations of producers," to locally administer "distribution of rental or benefit payments" under the contracts.

In January 1936, the United States Supreme Court invalidated production control features of the 1933 Act but Congress on February 29, 1936, passed the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The basic purpose of this Act was to preserve and improve soil fertility, promote the economic use and conservation of the land, and eliminate wasteful and unscientific use of our natural resources. The Secretary of Agriculture was empowered to make payments or grants to producers, but was prohibited from entering into contracts with producers as had been done under the 1933 Act. This Act, as amended, directs the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the services of local and State committees to carry out certain provisions of the Act. The Act also authorized the Secretary to designate committee administrative units (not more than

one county or parts of counties) and it specified committee election procedures. It provided for election, by farmers, of local or community committees of three farmer members, a county delegation to elect the county committee (three farmer members), and appointment by the Secretary of Agriculture of three to five farmers as members of the State committee. Presently California and Texas have five State committee members. County agricultural agents were designated as ex officio members of the county committee but without power to vote and State Extension Directors as ex officio members of the State committee with power to vote.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, also contains references to the farmer committee system. Under this Act, the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP), established by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, were continued. Committees were to be used to apportion farm allotments when in effect for tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts. The Act also authorized adminstrative funds for committees to carry out purposes of the Act and reiterated that the Secretary should utilize the services of the committees as provided under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The Sugar Act of 1948 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to "utilize the services of State and County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees, or other committees to carry out certain provisions of the Act."

Sections of 117 of the Soil Bank Act of 1956 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to "utilize the services of local, county and State committees established under Section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

EARLY DAYS OF COMMITTEE OPERATION

The AAA of 1933 established production controls and benefit contracts for seven basic crops: wheat, cotton, corn, hogs, rice, tobacco, and milk. Amendments in 1934 and 1935 added dairy, beef cattle, sugar beets, peanuts, rye, flax, barley, grain sorghums, sugar cane, and potatoes.

County Agricultural Extension Agents provided the local means of establishing temporary county committees of local farmers who took applications from producers for crop reduction contracts. The producers who sign contracts then met to form associations. Thereafter, the associations met by townships or communities to elect a chairman and a permanent township committee. The township chairmen together formed the county board, the forerunner of our present county committees. Elections were spirited with attendance sometime ranging as high as 70 - 80% of the eligible voters.

Special committees were set up by the county boards, such as the allotment committee which checked and adjusted individual farm allotments. Work carried on by the local committees included accepting contracts, making recommendations for approval to the Secretary, measuring crop acreage, and other responsibilities.

Farmer committeemen were a source of candidates for appraisers in purchasing cattle, sheep, and goats under the livestock purchase program during the 1934 drought emergency.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, during the three years these programs were in effect, adjustment payments to farmers totaled $1,108,322,870.

The success of the committee system in administering these early programs paved the way for greater responsibilities under the legislation of 1936 and 1938.

GROWING COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY

The Taylor Grazing Act of 1933 set up districts to regulate grazing on public lands. Local committees of ranchers acted as advisors to the public agency managing the land. Although grazing of public land was effectively controlled, an additional burden was placed on private grazing land. Under authority of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, a system was set up to control grazing on private holdings. By 1938, this function was incorporated into the regular Agricultural Conservation Program and practices such as deferred grazing, re-seeding, water resource development and fencing were carried out under the committee system.

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 brought about significant changes in the structure of the farmer-committee system. Up to this point, programs had been administered by committees under the guidance of the Extension Service. This Act required that committee elections be held. The result was an autonomous committee system having close relationships to the Extension Service and other agricultural agencies. The States were divided into administrative regions, each with a Regional Director supervising State, county, and community committees within the area. An administrator headed the entire field organization at the Washington level.

Two different types of administrative organizations developed. Generally, in the north central region, State and county committees worked full time. In most of the other regions they functioned as policy-making boards with executive officers carrying out their policy.

Committees under the Act of 1936 were used to set crop allotments, determine soil depletion and soil conserving crop bases, measure acreages, certify applications for conservation payments, and many other duties. During this period (1936 and 1937), committees handled $151,523,000 in the conservation practice funds. (Appendix - Exhibit A)

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 placed additional duties on the committee system. This Act provided for crop allotments and set up marketing quotas and price supports for the so-called basic crops of corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. Committees were made the sole administrators of allotments and marketing quotas where farmers were dealt with directly. At different times, the designation "Triple A", ACP, and PMA was given committees. Presently, they are called Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees.

From 1939 to 1953 farmer committees administered the Crop Insurance Program. Committeemen collected premiums, inspected damaged fields, and made crop-loss adjustments. Committeemen at that time were the local representatives of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Committee operation of this program was terminated by Secretary's regulations and administrative instructions in 1953. During this period premiums totaling $240,580,776 were collected through the committee system. (Appendix - Exhibit B)

COMMITTEE WARTIME ACTIVITIES

With the advent of World War II, Federal farm program emphasis shifted to-all out production. Production controls through crop allotments and quotas were relaxed or completely removed and price supports increased to step up food production to war needs. The committee system played a vital role in the quick transition to all-out production.

Committeemen were responsible for the commodity loan programs, approving loan application, storage facilities, supervising erection and maintenance of storage bins and other functions. They also established tobacco acreage allotments and "normal" yields, kept growers informed about Support Purchase Programs, and arranged for grading, storing, and shipping of commodities, assisted with many phases of the Sugar Program and the Crop Insurance Program.

Production payments for fluid milk and butterfat were started in 1943 when milk production began to fall. To protect consumers the War Food Administration initiated dairy producer payments to offset rising production costs when retail prices were fixed by wartime regulations. Farmer committeemen, under this program, received applications for production payments, verified evidence of milk sales, and issued sight drafts as payments. From 1943 to 1946 farmer committees handled $1,198,664,000 in dairy production payments. (Appendix - Exhibit C)

As a result of the program milk production soared and by July 1945 it was 19% above the previous years' average. Another vital food need had been met through an important program administered by the committee system.

Beef, lamb, and sheep production payments were set up in 1945 and similar to the dairy production payments, were administered through the committees. War demands had brought on heavy slaughter of beef cattle, sheep, and lambs. As with dairy payments, the program stimulated beef and sheep production to meet demands while protecting consumers against price increases necessitated by higher war production costs.

In addition to their regular duties for food production, committeemen successfully executed a host of other difficult and trying jobs. (Appendix - Exhibit D) Because AAA farmer committees represented each State and county in the Nation, the chairman of the county committee was named chairman of the County USDA War Board. The war boards consisted of representatives of all Department agencies operating in the counties and the activities covered the entire range of agricultural efforts toward winning the war. The county AAA committee chairman was usually obliged to spend full time on war board and AAA work. County AAA offices became the hub of agricultural war activity. AAA committeemen were involved in rationing of farm machinery and other agricultural tools of production, estimating demands and allocating available supplies. They reviewed applications and made recommendations for on-farm construction, assisted farmers with transportation problems, cooperated in bond and scrap metal drives, allocated surplus supplies, and many other duties.

An especially noteworthy and dramatic example of committee system operation occurred in the Corn-For-War Program. An alarming shortage of corn deliveries to refineries had developed during the spring of 1944. By April of that year, corn deliveries had virtually stopped. Corn was a vital material, needed for explosives, waterproof coatings, drugs, K-rations, rubber production, and scores of other war uses. County and community committeemen became the heart of a vigorous corn drive. An intensive campaign was conducted with meetings, press and radio releases, and a farm to farm canvass performed by the committeemen. As a result, 72 million bushels of corn were delivered during the campaign; enough to meet requirements until the next crop became available.

COMMITTEES AND POST-WAR ADJUSTMENTS

The Agricultural Act of 1948 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices by commodity loans on both "basic" and non-basic commodities. This was followed by the Agricultural Act of 1949,

amending the 1948 Act, and calling for supports on six designated non-basic commodities: wool, tung nuts, honey, Irish potatoes, milk, and butterfat, plus supports on any other permissive commodity.

During 1947 - 1950, the committee system handled a total of $4,942,467,000 in price support loans to producers on 19 commodities. The total amount of loans on 29 different commodities from 1933 through June 30, 1950 was $10,232,400,000 with a total net loss on this amount of less than five cents on each dollar invested in loans!

A new method of price support under the committees, the purchase agreement, was first utilized in 1948 on such crops as grains and beans.

The Sugar Act of 1948 extended the Jones-Costigan Act of 1934. Committees of farmers had set proportionate shares (allotments) in sugar producing areas under authority of the Jones-Costigan Act. They operated separately from the regular committee system until passage of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. With the extension of the Sugar Program under the 1948 legislation, the farmer committee system continued, as one of its duties, the allocation of sugar proportionate shares (allotments) among producers, conditional payments, and other phases of the program.

With creation of the Production and Marketing Administration in 1945, farmer committees were known as "PMA" Committees, and this designation was used until November 1953 when they became Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees. This designation has been used up to the present time.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Many additional administrative improvements have been added to the committee system during the last few years. In 1953, under the Commodity Stabilization Service, a major policy change was effected. The new policy provided for separation of local policy forming and policy execution functions. Program and administration policy forming functions continued to rest with State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees, which are selected by the Secretary of Agriculture, and with county ASC committees selected by farmers themselves.

Policy execution at the county level is carried out by county committee employees. A State administrative officer, working under direction of the State committee carries out policy determinations of the State committee. All committeemen work on a day-to-day rather than a full-time basis. This policy enables each member of the committee to perform

functions which he is best able to carry out. State and county committees act as a "board of directors," but are not asked to spend their time on routine administrative matters.

A rotation system was also established whereby one or more State committeemen were replaced each year to bring in fresh and wider viewpoints and to insure stability and continuity of policy.

In 1954, several important changes in regulations governing the election qualifications and duties of committees were made.

1. County and community election boards were established which conducted annual elections of committeemen.

2. The number of consecutive terms a farmer could serve as a county or community committeeman was limited to three, except that where all three members of the county committee had already served three consecutive terms, one member would be eligible for election to one additional term. (This limitation was removed by Section 503 of the Agricultural Act of 1954)

3. Officials of general farm organizations were prohibited from serving as members of county ASC committees.

4. Committeemen were prohibited from acting (a) as sales agents of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; (b) * as marketing quota review committeemen; and (c) as employees of their own county offices.

Other revisions provided for removal of county and community committeemen and election board members only by a majority vote of the State ASC committee. Provision was also made for the right of appeal by ousted committeemen or election board members to the State ASC committee and to the Deputy Administrator for Production Adjustment, Commodity Stabilization Service.

By 1957, orientation and training programs for committeemen and employees, classification and pay plans for county office employees, comprehensive audits and operation review procedures were instituted as additional refinements in committee and committee employee operations. (Appendix - Exhibit E) Eligibility requirements for State committeemen were also defined. (Appendix - Exhibit F)

The National Wool Act of 1954 and the Soil Bank Act of 1956 were two major legislative actions placing additional heavy responsibility on the committee system. Under the Wool Act, committees receive and approve applications for incentive payments and draw Commodity Credit Corporation sight drafts to pay producers. The Act is designed to stimulate production of wool to bring annual production up to the 300 million pound goal established by Congress under the Act.

*4. (As of August 15, 1960, the restriction noted in (b) will be removed.)

The Soil Bank Act of 1956 directed the Secretary to use State, county, and community committees to administer the Act at the local level. Principal duties of committeemen for this program include accepting and approving contracts for placing acreage under the Conservation Reserve, establishing annual rental and practice payment rates, establishing policy for weed control and other measures on Conservation Reserve land, and acting on violations and contract termination.

In addition to the Soil Bank Program, which is the most recent major joint-action program assigned to the farmer committee system, committees currently have charge of the Agricultural Conservation Program, acreage allotments and marketing quotas, Loans and Price Support Operations including supervising of CCC binsites, farm grain storage and mobile dryer loans, the sugar program, the wool program, and special emergency programs. (Appendix - Exhibit G)

The Agricultural Conservation Program and the Soil Bank Program reach into practically every farming community in the Nation.

Figures for the Agricultural Conservation Program through 1958 show that committeemen have approved a total of $4,284,359,000 for all conservation practice payments since inception of this program in 1936. (Appendix - Exhibit A) This conservation effort, under local direction of the committee system, has been responsible for establishment of 86,977,851 acres of protective vegetative cover, 2,272,129 acres forest trees planted, construction of 1,235,300 livestock water structures, and application of 391,379,000 tons of liming materials to improve protective cover. These are a few of many practices offered under this program.

Under the Soil Bank Act of 1956, committees have approved 305,003 Soil Bank contracts which placed 28,432,186 acres of farm land in the Conservation Reserve. (Appendix - Exhibit H) Under this program the Government is currently obligated to pay farmers $411,420,909 in annual rental payments and $134,749,111 in conservation practice funds (Appendix - Exhibit I) to pay for the establishment of 21,788,841 acres of trees and other conservation practices. (Appendix - Exhibit H)

Another major responsibility for committeemen is operation of acreage allotment and marketing quota programs and price support program functions. Up to July 1, 1959, more than 30 billion dollars in commodity price support loans had been administered through the committee system. (Appendix - Exhibit J)

Total funds for carrying out these programs administered through the farmer committee system since its inception are in the many billions of dollars. Losses due to dishonesty and mal-administration by committees have been insignificant by comparison - far less than those occurring in the banking system of the country.

A very important contribution of the committee system to American agriculture has been the development of agricultural leadership. The committee system has attracted and developed many outstanding farm leaders. There are numerous examples of farmer committeemen rising up through the ranks of the committee system to responsible positions in local, State, and National farmer organizations. Although this may be considered a by-product of the committee system, the contribution of committeemen to Government, private farm organizations, and groups is widely recognized. (Appendix - Exhibit K)

Committee assistance to other agencies such as the Federal Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and others has been carried out with maximum cooperation. With only a few exceptions, good relationships with other agencies and groups have prevailed throughout the history of the committee system.

As the committee system grew in stature and importance, a definite philosophy evolved. (Appendix - Exhibit L) This philosophy can best be summarized in the following points:

1. The committeeman's knowledge of local conditions is vitally necessary for successful execution of "joint-action" programs.

2. The committee system permits local adaptation of programs to the particular needs of different farming areas and conditions throughout the country.

3. The committee system permits the people affected by Federal farm programs to have a part in administration and in the development of those programs.

4. A sound judgment factor is contributed to operation of programs by farmer-elected committee system.

5. Through the committee system recommendations for policy and program changes can be transmitted from the "grass-roots" to higher levels and thus permit better adaptation of programs to local conditions.

6. The State committee rotation system provides an opportunity for new committee membership to come from different areas with fresh ideas so that all types of agriculture and all local conditions may be represented in committee operations.

This philosophy has provided the basic foundation for successful administration of "joint-action" farm programs.

Today nearly 100,000 farmer-committeemen serve agriculture and the Nation. These committeemen represent 30,000 community committees, 3,000 county committees, and 3 - 5 committeemen from each State. Farmers themselves elect their county and community committees and thereby obtain a "democratic" form of farm program administration not otherwise possible. The farmer committee system provides a way for farmers to unify their efforts to accomplish Federal farm program objectives.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. -----

ACREAGE ALLOTMENT AND MARKETING QUOTA SUMMARY. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Commodity Stabilization Service, Price Division. 1955.

2. -----

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION AND RELATED PROGRAMS. A Compilation of Information on Such Programs up to and Including March 15, 1948. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Production and Marketing Administration, Information Branch. 1948.

3. -----

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTS; Providing a Graphic Summary of Operations, 1933 - June 30, 1959. U. S. Department of Agriculture. 1959.

4. -----

COMPILATION OF STATUTES RELATING TO Soil Conservation, Marketing Quotas and Allotments, Soil Bank, Commodity Credit Corporation, Price Support, Export and Surplus Removal, Crop Insurance, Sugar Payments and Quotas, Marketing Agreements and Orders, and Related Statutes as of January 1, 1959. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Commodity Stabilization Service. Agricultural Handbook No. 158. 1959.

5. -----

CSS BACKGROUND INFORMATION; Price Support Directed or Authorized by Farm Legislation (1933 - 1959). U. S. Department of Agriculture. Commodity Stabilization Service. BI No. 9. 1959.

6. -----

CSS BACKGROUND INFORMATION; The Price Support Program. BI No. 4. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Commodity Stabilization Service. 1959.

7. -----

EVOLUTION OF THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM 1920 - 1956. U. S. Department of Agriculture. PRICE PROGRAMS, Agricultural Information Bulletin. No. 135.

8. FRISCHKNECHT, REED L.

FARM PRICE AND INCOME SUPPORT PROGRAMS 1933 - 1950. Institute of Government, University of Utah. Research Monograph Series: Number One. 1953.

9. -----

PARITY HANDBOOK, Revised, October 1958. U. S. Department of Agriculture. 1958.

10. -----

PRICE SUPPORT HANDBOOK. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Commodity Stabilization Service, Price Division. 1955

11. -----

REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY - 1944. U. S. Department of Agriculture. War Food Administration. 1944.

12. -----

REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY - 1945. Director of the Field Service Branch. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Production and Marketing Administration. 1945.

13. -----

SECRETARY BENSON ANNOUNCES CHANGES AFFECTING LOCAL ASC COMMITTEES. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Press Release - USDA 1538 - 54. June 15, 1954.

14. -----

SECRETARY BENSON ANNOUNCES CHANGES IN PMA COMMITTEE OPERATIONS. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Press Release - USDA 687 - 53. March 25, 1953.

15. -----

SUGAR REPORTS (Monthly). U. S. Department of Agriculture. Commodity Stabilization Service, Sugar Division. No. 91. November 1959.

16. -----

THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION. A Summary of Program Development and Accomplishments. From 1936 to 1952 With Emphasis on Program Trends and Needed Improvements. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Production and Marketing Administration, Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch, Program Analysis Section. Report 202. 1952.

17. -----

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration. G. 1 - 25. 1933 - 34.

A P P E N D I X

EXHIBIT A

Estimated gross assistance for conservation practices under the Agricultural Conservation Program, United States and Insular areas, 1936-58 *

State and area	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954 1/	1955 2/	1956 3/	1957 4/	1958 5/	Grand total
	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Conn.	79	236	182	269	286	318	323	378	536	511	556	483	263	466	598	562	510	434	216	422	461	519	421	9,029
Del.	75	198	417	368	319	318	320	413	730	657	629	489	229	384	438	437	359	349	183	276	332	387	327	8,634
Maine	154	483	336	599	539	626	590	737	1,028	883	1,029	1,055	476	889	1,158	1,176	916	927	703	1,018	997	1,095	951	18,365
Md.	438	671	1,048	993	890	947	947	1,601	2,473	2,100	2,640	1,914	888	1,532	1,685	1,696	1,407	1,289	893	1,217	1,366	1,437	1,333	31,405
Mass.	68	313	266	434	423	456	514	586	755	784	751	768	331	575	706	633	532	521	271	479	582	592	583	11,923
N. H.	67	195	170	332	355	334	407	311	392	339	398	417	241	444	578	558	495	449	253	511	541	545	551	8,883
N. J.	152	918	681	558	522	578	730	1,030	1,432	1,279	1,238	1,059	558	891	990	929	798	744	403	601	748	766	708	18,313
N. Y.	1,310	3,817	2,653	3,180	3,581	4,139	4,918	5,098	6,079	6,681	6,622	5,833	3,297	5,611	6,262	6,320	5,251	4,262	2,761	4,556	5,027	5,001	4,978	107,237
Pa.	1,036	2,786	2,635	3,117	3,415	3,582	4,068	5,171	6,478	5,950	5,748	5,358	3,330	6,294	6,365	6,504	5,736	5,209	3,429	4,257	5,425	5,292	4,954	106,139
R. I.	6	27	24	37	44	54	57	60	89	87	83	74	44	84	93	97	81	76	33	63	68	87	80	1,448
Vt.	201	447	506	825	819	980	993	985	1,309	1,027	947	800	678	1,275	1,279	1,309	1,138	1,185	767	1,147	1,210	1,342	1,120	22,289
Va.	991	1,438	2,483	2,332	2,456	2,980	3,106	5,162	4,548	4,804	5,808	4,998	2,796	4,737	5,331	5,412	4,661	4,505	2,739	4,338	4,721	4,747	4,760	89,853
W. Va.	238	676	1,144	1,423	1,440	1,675	1,842	3,202	2,572	1,974	2,560	2,431	1,202	1,997	2,096	2,149	1,887	1,348	1,058	1,771	1,752	1,756	1,741	39,934
N. E. Area**	4,815	12,205	12,545	14,467	15,089	16,987	18,815	24,734	28,421	27,076	29,009	25,679	14,333	25,179	27,579	27,782	23,771	21,298	13,709	20,656	23,230	23,566	22,507	473,452
Ala.	1,883	1,394	3,091	3,830	3,230	3,162	2,682	5,413	7,499	4,538	4,934	6,190	3,910	7,486	7,525	7,758	6,487	4,189	4,731	6,590	6,114	6,191	6,418	115,245
Ark.	1,703	1,803	2,406	3,425	3,300	3,961	3,289	4,055	7,678	4,065	6,046	5,999	3,023	5,603	6,109	5,916	4,974	4,571	4,086	5,091	5,270	5,058	5,170	102,601
Fla.	616	1,068	2,141	1,826	1,757	1,633	1,830	2,284	2,947	2,093	3,152	2,568	1,260	2,179	2,499	2,469	2,202	2,155	1,628	2,420	2,526	2,735	2,840	48,828
Ga.	1,774	1,539	3,461	3,704	2,936	2,640	2,957	4,658	5,800	4,442	7,206	6,699	3,853	7,522	8,934	9,148	7,211	6,047	5,656	7,760	7,655	7,670	7,665	126,937
La.	1,007	925	1,691	1,748	1,591	1,953	1,616	2,132	6,569	2,640	3,703	3,843	2,418	4,027	4,982	5,105	4,304	2,603	3,281	3,322	4,463	4,369	4,302	72,594
Miss.	1,690	1,884	2,966	3,532	3,122	3,822	3,203	5,944	9,290	5,082	6,624	6,936	3,713	7,256	7,956	7,921	7,579	3,703	5,223	6,836	6,823	6,826	6,877	124,808
N. Car.	963	1,403	2,944	2,549	3,900	4,202	4,913	7,609	5,805	5,655	7,426	7,209	4,038	7,544	8,061	8,291	7,077	5,584	5,840	6,418	7,155	7,592	7,071	129,249
S. Car.	967	595	1,919	2,196	1,957	2,297	2,376	2,652	5,311	2,339	2,673	3,554	2,156	3,764	3,972	3,920	3,243	3,153	2,508	3,351	3,205	3,753	3,738	65,599
Tenn.	1,794	2,267	4,510	4,503	4,249	4,968	4,840	7,718	9,076	7,947	7,261	7,152	3,925	6,897	7,151	7,103	6,046	5,787	4,435	6,056	5,966	5,914	5,845	131,410
S. E. Area**	12,397	12,878	25,129	27,313	26,042	28,638	27,706	42,465	59,975	38,801	49,025	50,150	28,296	52,278	57,189	57,631	49,123	37,792	37,388	47,844	49,177	50,108	49,926	917,271
Ill.	2,629	2,013	1,957	3,446	3,447	4,039	7,374	9,255	12,455	10,739	12,257	10,693	5,545	10,005	10,684	10,388	9,139	7,836	4,260	6,568	8,598	8,189	9,418	170,934
Ind.	2,072	1,800	1,425	2,217	2,329	2,612	4,166	5,078	7,532	6,679	6,509	7,060	3,431	5,532	6,692	6,943	6,068	5,893	3,677	4,936	6,099	6,443	6,113	111,306
Iowa	3,909	3,064	2,641	4,616	4,173	4,505	6,985	9,333	11,991	14,157	12,389	11,150	5,163	10,363	11,876	11,885	10,177	9,106	6,176	7,881	10,093	10,359	9,511	191,503
Ky.	3,103	4,215	6,107	5,983	6,165	6,608	6,176	10,200	8,884	9,944	11,696	8,368	4,030	6,965	7,795	7,542	6,768	6,868	4,999	6,712	7,323	7,476	7,424	101,351
Mich.	1,958	2,566	1,487	2,211	2,097	2,659	5,026	6,804	7,315	6,512	8,079	6,930	2,938	5,407	6,257	6,064	5,349	4,544	1,925	2,905	3,988	4,970	5,241	103,232
Mo.	2,231	2,751	2,516	4,225	4,198	4,864	6,753	9,004	11,971	9,075	11,528	11,018	4,729	8,458	11,620	11,081	9,777	7,823	7,772	9,016	9,645	9,416	9,506	178,977
Ohio	2,137	2,263	1,454	2,452	2,383	2,667	4,596	6,336	8,959	7,186	9,616	8,381	3,712	6,779	6,523	6,993	6,111	5,591	3,311	5,086	6,151	6,372	6,405	121,464
Wis.	2,878	3,249	2,168	3,211	3,031	3,746	8,319	9,850	11,392	9,707	9,832	8,054	4,159	7,196	7,643	7,476	6,497	5,550	2,121	4,023	4,993	5,583	5,786	136,464
M. W. Area**	20,917	21,921	19,755	28,361	27,823	31,700	49,395	65,860	80,499	73,999	81,906	71,654	33,707	60,705	69,090	68,372	59,886	53,211	34,241	47,127	56,890	58,808	59,404	1,175,231
Ariz.	217	433	549	625	642	718	552	751	1,272	1,200	2,185	1,683	658	1,179	1,701	1,720	1,437	1,327	1,125	1,559	1,568	1,584	1,584	26,269
Calif.	1,123	2,873	2,804	2,488	2,953	3,481	4,856	5,845	6,910	7,733	6,390	6,260	2,331	4,850	5,505	5,268	4,794	4,579	2,638	2,472	4,909	3,780	5,572	100,414
Colo.	617	1,691	1,293	1,469	1,768	1,921	3,353	3,517	5,779	4,495	4,260	3,997	1,799	3,738	4,041	4,051	3,372	3,310	2,377	3,486	3,476	3,129	3,383	70,322
Kans.	1,059	5,476	1,523	2,491	2,668	2,760	7,289	6,117	11,879	7,232	10,021	8,737	4,331	7,870	8,121	7,063	6,457	5,787	4,649	6,136	6,835	6,808	6,189	137,498
Nev.	59	114	91	123	142	168	150	191	308	324	397	429	127	235	269	266	255	275	215	305	314	373	385	5,515
N. Mex.	910	1,651	1,450	1,481	1,466	1,553	1,721	2,528	3,414	2,946	3,538	2,612	1,071	1,824	2,172	2,085	1,750	1,752	1,166	1,814	1,902	1,913	1,949	44,668
Okla.	1,548	2,352	1,365	1,823	1,802	1,814	4,407	4,348	10,899	6,457	8,523	7,853	4,505	8,296	9,137	8,908	7,732	5,681	4,825	6,102	7,831	7,323	7,641	131,172
Texas	4,749	7,783	10,744	11,335	12,220	10,071	15,991	15,512	33,448	19,642	21,703	20,190	12,244	19,339	22,793	22,906	19,638	13,811	15,075	20,263	20,609	20,438	20,762	391,266
Utah	320	394	278	561	553	702	698	885	1,469	1,173	1,677	1,284	520	1,175	1,531	1,346	1,278	1,296	933	1,220	1,382	1,393	1,399	23,467
S. W. Area**	10,602	22,767	20,097	22,396	24,214	23,188	39,017	39,694	75,378	51,202	58,694	53,045	27,586	48,506	55,270	53,613	46,713	37,818	33,003	43,357	48,826	46,741	48,864	930,591
Idaho	620	658	721	1,260	988	1,243	1,400	1,741	3,255	2,319	3,060	2,226	1,027	1,583	1,767	1,556	1,566	1,718	1,162	1,455	1,848	1,864	[illegible]	3[illegible],901
Minn.	2,455	2,402	1,621	2,834	2,658	2,947	5,192	8,255	8,284	8,193	8,810	8,335	3,882	7,075	7,790	6,820	6,503	6,592	3,671	4,563	6,245	4,890	6,591	126,608
Mont.	1,347	2,810	2,146	2,849	2,949	2,841	3,504	4,118	5,683	3,938	4,513	3,941	2,025	3,602	4,200	3,871	3,468	3,240	1,500	2,098	2,979	3,838	3,725	75,185
Nebr.	1,279	2,753	1,507	2,642	2,733	2,574	5,342	6,922	8,950	7,713	10,612	7,693	3,531	6,655	8,002	7,405	6,593	6,072	3,665	4,533	6,711	6,866	5,608	126,361
N. Dak.	1,745	2,618	2,571	3,682	3,364	2,483	5,155	4,810	4,991	4,248	6,422	6,661	3,037	5,349	5,983	5,777	4,985	4,834	2,899	4,227	4,691	4,846	3,954	99,332
Oreg.	549	1,264	1,366	1,979	1,913	2,086	1,636	2,358	3,782	2,760	3,157	2,905	1,187	2,223	2,243	2,469	2,161	2,092	1,367	1,780	2,312	2,275	2,233	48,097
S. Dak.	1,087	4,525	2,265	3,278	3,213	3,471	5,860	7,326	6,635	3,997	5,410	5,812	2,812	5,492	6,067	4,358	4,582	5,120	2,647	4,762	5,186	5,024	4,825	103,754
Wash.	688	769	1,006	1,608	1,424	1,465	1,536	3,010	4,012	3,474	3,167	3,335	1,448	2,621	2,838	2,835	2,492	2,464	1,277	1,807	2,514	2,499	2,485	50,774
Wyo.	394	858	1,082	1,482	1,528	1,635	1,366	1,844	2,518	2,126	2,431	1,958	880	1,459	2,263	1,926	1,958	1,650	1,459	1,579	2,144	2,150	2,145	38,835
N. W. Area**	10,164	18,657	14,285	21,614	20,770	20,745	30,991	40,384	48,110	38,768	47,582	42,866	19,829	36,059	41,153	37,017	34,308	33,782	19,647	26,804	34,630	34,252	33,430	[illegible]
U. S.	58,895	88,428	91,811	114,151	113,938	121,258	165,924	213,137	292,383	229,846	266,216	243,394	123,751	222,727	250,281	244,415	213,801	183,901	137,988	185,788	212,753	213,475	214,153	4,2[illegible],3[illegible]
Alaska	1	3	1	7	7	5	7	11	7	11	11	19	17	32	34	29	27	28	21	30	29	45	54	436
Hawaii	577	762	101	118	114	108	104	114	97	74	94	82	53	105	191	203	184	147	117	115	121	154	190	3,925
P. R.	793	1,238	1,009	1,163	771	849	805	870	530	463	765	557	423	687	1,045	959	899	902	721	872	966	951	935	19,173
V. I.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	9	22	43	14	10	8	12	8	10	7	5	148
Insular**	1,371	2,003	1,111	1,288	892	962	916	995	634	548	870	658	502	846	1,313	1,205	1,120	1,085	871	1,025	1,126	1,157	1,184	23,682
Total 6/	60,266	90,431	92,922	115,439	114,830	122,220	166,840	214,132	293,017	230,394	267,086	244,052	124,257	223,573	251,592	245,623	21[illegible],918	18[illegible],986	138,857	186,811	213,878	21[illegible],632	215,315	4,22[illegible],074
N. S. C. P.	466	360	997	1,639	1,178	1,740	1,247	1,110	850	674	469	695	246	282	414	477	478	417	416	453	458	480	552	16,098
Total 7/	60,732	90,791	93,919	117,078	116,008	123,960	168,087	215,242	293,867	231,068	267,555	244,748	124,503	223,855	252,006	246,100	215,396	185,403	139,272	187,264	214,336	215,112	215,867	4,242,172
Supp. (emer)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	12,254	5,093	7,676	5,338	6,735	1,042	4,028	42,166
Grand total**	60,732	90,791	93,919	117,078	116,008	123,960	168,087	215,242	293,867	231,068	267,555	244,748	124,503	223,855	252,006	246,100	227,650	190,496	146,948	192,602	221,071	216,154	219,895	4,284,338

* Includes funds used for cost-sharing for conservation practices, small cost-share increases, program services, nondeductible CMS, and technical services furnished by other agencies. Excludes funds used for unused CMS and small cost-share increases advanced in connection with such unused CMS.

** U. S. totals are rounded from complete figures. Area totals and grand total are added totals.

1/ Excludes $183,276 used for the purchase of unused CMS under the 1954 ACP and $13,515 for small cost-share increases advanced in connection with such unused CMS.

2/ Excludes $182,070 used for the purchase of unused CMS under the 1955 ACP and $9,034 for small cost-share increases advanced in connection with such unused CMS.

3/ Excludes $186,341 used for the purchase of unused CMS under the 1956 ACP and $4,465 for small cost-share increases advanced in connection with such unused CMS.

4/ Excludes $285,421 used for the purchase of unused CMS under the 1957 ACP and $4,761 for small cost-share increases advanced in connection with such unused CMS.

5/ Excludes $164,901 used for the purchase of unused CMS under the 1958 ACP and $2,323 for small cost-share increases advanced in connection with such unused CMS.

6/ Excludes cost-sharing for supplemental (emergency) practices and the Naval Stores Conservation Program.

7/ Excludes cost-sharing for supplemental (emergency) practices.

ACPS:STAT
October 26, 1959

EXHIBIT B

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE PREMIUMS FOR CROP YEARS 1939 THROUGH 1953

Crop Year	Premiums
1939	$ 3,410,940
1940	9,155,000
1941	7,096,349
1942	14,747,185
1943	17,459,455
1944	No Insurance
1945	9,273,559
1946	33,091,352
1947	40,648,690
1948	12,683,974
1949	11,501,239
1950	14,103,899
1951	19,110,633
1952	21,200,815
1953	27,097,686
TOTAL	$240,580,776

EXHIBIT C

GOVERNMENT DAIRY PRODUCTION PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

ON MILK AND BUTTERFAT SOLD, 1943 - 46 1/

1943	October - December	$ 49,664,000
1944		385,454,000
1945		483,061,000
1946	January - June	280,485,000
		$1,198,664,000

1/ Published in Farm Production, Disposition and Income From Milk, 1946-47, April 1948. Data Compiled by Field Service Branch, PMA

WAR-TIME ACTIVITIES

War Board Activities

One of the most important contributions the committee organization has made to the national war program, aside from its AAA work to adjust food production to war needs, is its service to the United States Department of Agriculture State and county War Boards. These boards were organized by the Secretary of Agriculture in July 1941 to coordinate the defense, and later the war, activities of all Department agencies.

Because the AAA committees represented each State and county in the country and because these committeemen were farmers, the chairmen of the county AAA committees were named chairmen of the county U.S.D.A. War Boards. In the States the chairmen (the executive officer in Southern States) were designated the chairmen of the State U.S.D.A. War Boards.

The boards consisted of representatives of all Department agencies operating in the field. In August 1943, the membership of the State boards was expanded to include State Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture and State Commissioners of Agriculture.

The work of the boards covers such a wide range that in virtually every State and county the chairman has been obliged to devote full time to the job, and the State and county AAA offices, which were designated as headquarters for the boards, have become the hub of agriculture's war activities.

The AAA chairman, in his capacity as chairman of the War Board, and frequently other members of the AAA committee, have many responsibilities in connection with War Board work. A summary of these activities follows:

Farm Machinery

AAA committeemen--
... appointed and worked with farm machinery rationing committees which considered applications from farmers and issued purchase certificates, cooperated in programs for repair and exchange of used farm machinery and for custom use of machinery.

Among the programs to help farmers overcome wartime production handicaps was the rationing of farm machinery.

Because the manufacture of farm machinery competes with guns, tanks, ships, and other war weapons for labor and raw materials, it became necessary early in the war for the War Production Board to establish manufacturing quotas for farm machinery based upon a past period of production.

Working with WPB in estimating demands and the allocation of available supplies was the War Food Administration's Office of Materials and Facilities. Regulations drawn up by Office of Materials and Facilities went to the States through the Special Services Section of AAA regional offices.

Local machinery needs were surveyed and distribution plans made by State AAA committees, cooperating with the farm-machinery industry, and county committees.

Decisions to determine the eligibility of individual farmers were made by the county machinery rationing committees after talks with applicants and a review of their farming operations and possible contributions to farm production. This committee was usually headed by a county committeeman, with two other farmers completing the membership.

Late in September 1944, rationing of all farm machinery except corn pickers was discontinued.

Other Rationing

AAA committeemen--
... allocated scarce supplies and equipment, handled applications to convert steel-wheel tractors to rubber tires, advised local price and rationing boards, issued priority certificates for controlled hardware items.

Other rationed or controlled supplies and machinery have been crawler-type tractors, certain stationary engines, electric motors, copper wire, lumber, and many hardware items such as small tools, fencing and wiring. After a farmer's need for an item has been verified, a priority certificate is given him which he presents to his dealer as authorization to purchase the item. For certain items the applicant's application for a rating is filed with the War Production Board with a letter from the county AAA committee recommending approval of the application.

Construction

AAA committeemen--
... reviewed applications and made recommendations for on-farm construction, promoted maintenance and repair of existing facilities, issued emergency construction approval to eligible farmers.

Farmer applications for construction projects involving the use of critical materials and costing in excess of specified exemptions were subject to restrictions of the War Production Board. Such construction had to be approved by WPB, acting upon recommendations of State and County AAA committees.

Transportation

AAA committeemen--
... appointed farm transportation committees who assisted farmers in obtaining transportation facilities and developing cooperative plans to conserve farm transportation; upon request, made advisory recommendations to local war price and rationing boards and the Office of Defense Transportation.

The procedure whereby AAA committees have reviewed farmers' applications for rationed items such as tires and farm trucks under jurisdiction of other agencies has speeded up decisions by those agencies on the applications. The county farm transportation committee, headed by a county AAA committeeman, usually included two other farmers, a trucker, and a farm-supply dealer.

Miscellaneous

AAA committeemen--
... cooperated in bond and scrap metal drives, certified applications for frozen-food lockers, issued certificates of release for fruits and berries which might be used for alcohol, certified farm applications to the Bureau of Mines for the use of explosives.

Agriculture has cooperated with the Treasury Department in conducting war-bond drives; with the War Production Board in (1) collecting and shipping scrap iron and scrap salvage from farms for use in war industries, and (2) building and maintaining home-storage facilities; in assisting in purchase of war-plant or training-camp sites; and in relocating displaced farm families.

Surplus War Property

AAA committeemen--
... determine agricultural users with most urgent need for surplus trucks and issue certification letters to farmers or dealers, select eligible dealers to purchase machinery for farm use, aid in arranging for disposal of used consumer goods, certify areas for sale of new goods through farm cooperatives.

As the war progresses, much material used by the armed forces of the types needed by civilians becomes "surplus". The problem is not only one of disposal, but also one of distribution in areas where the need is most critical.

For such items as surplus army trucks, machinery, hardware, and miscellaneous tools and equipment which are suitable for farm use, AAA committees cooperate with the Office of Materials and Facilities and the surplus disposal agencies in seeing that surplus goods reach areas of need. Community auction sales are held to dispose of surplus used

miscellaneous consumer goods. New consumer goods are sold through farm cooperatives and other established wholesale organizations after AAA State committees certify that the material for sale is needed by farmers in the territory served by the outlets.

Corn-For-War Program

> AAA committeemen--
> ... helped plan the drive, prepared and distributed information to radio stations and newspapers, canvassed farmers for corn pledges executed corn contracts, and facilitated shelling and delivery of corn to elevators.

Perhaps the outstanding emergency assignment made to AAA committeemen during the past year was the "corn-for-war" purchase program undertaken in the spring of 1944 at the request of the War Department and the War Production Board.

Two emergency set-aside orders had failed to obtain sufficient corn to keep war-essential corn refineries operating. Between January and March, receipts of corn at elevators had dropped from 10 million bushels to 2 1/2 million bushels a week, and by April, despite the set-aside orders, the flow of corn to processors came to a virtual standstill. Most corn processing plants, including the largest in the world at Argo, Illinois, were forced to shut down, and the others had to curtail operations.

The situation was particularly alarming because the refineries were processing corn for materials vital to the prosecution of the war -- explosives, core-binders for casting metals for warplane engines and machinery, waterproof coatings, fiberboard containers, penicillin and sulfa drugs, sirups for K-rations, butyl alcohol for rubber to go into gasoline tanks for airplanes, and scores of others.

Under a War Food Administration order, effective April 25, the Commodity Credit Corporation was made the sole buyer of corn for 60 days in 125 designated heavy corn-producing counties of Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Indiana. Free shelling and transportation services were offered by WFA as an added inducement for farmers to sell corn not needed for feed at a time when they were extra busy with farm work delayed by a late season.

Meetings were held at which AAA county and community committeemen laid plans for a vigorous corn drive. The farm-to-farm canvass that followed was accompanied by radio broadcasts and newspaper and magazine articles about the program, as well as addresses by AAA committeemen before public meetings and forums. The Army cooperated by sending speakers and combat films into the 125 counties to explain the uses and urgent need for corn in war production.

Approximately 72 million bushels of corn were delivered or placed under contract during the campaign. This was enough to carry processors through until the new crop became available. A survey conducted shortly after the campaign began showed that 99 percent of the farmers in the purchase area know of the program, and most of them understood that the corn was to be used for industrial war purposes.

The success of this emergency war program was fresh proof of the effectiveness of the farmer-committeemen organization in obtaining the cooperation of farmers for accomplishing a difficult job.

Protein Meal and Feed Distribution

> AAA committeemen--
> ... appointed feed advisory committees and with their help determined the needs of feed users, handled allocation and supervised distribution of feed supplies.

Serious shortages of protein meals developed late in 1943. Following public hearings, WFA took several steps designed to obtain a more equitable distribution of available supplies.

Feed manufacturers were limited in the amounts of protein meal they could use in mixed feeds, and provision was made for setting aside 20 percent of the total production of all processors for directed distribution by the Government to States. Meal allocations to States were based on past consumption, on shifts in livestock, changes in feeding habits, and availability of feed.

Set-aside meal was distributed to farmers through certificates issued by county AAA committees. Cooperating with AAA in obtaining an orderly flow of meal to points of need were local feed advisory committees, made up of representatives of the feed industry.

Altogether, 6,080,000 tons of oilseed meal were available for distribution in 1944. Directed distribution went far in curtailing black market dealings in protein meal and did much to prevent the development of surplus and deficit situations.

State "turn-backs" of set-aside meal in March 1944 gave evidence that the protein situation had eased materially, and by April, the worst of the problem was over. By July, meal was being offered to some buyers in quantities they could not handle because they already had on hand maximum 60-day supplies. WFA officials aimed to return complete feed distribution to the industry as soon as possible.

During the latter part of 1943, requests for wheat from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks exceeded the quantity available for feeding purposes, and orders had to be booked for future delivery.

On February 28, 1944, WFA inaugurated an allocation plan for distribution of feed wheat. Under the plan, a WFA feed committee determined the factors to be applied against the 1943 monthly average sales of mixers and dealers in establishing individual allocations. An allocation was made for distribution direct to feeders and to relieve emergency feed situations.

Feed mixers and dealers wanting feed wheat filed inventories of their 1943 operations with CCC regional offices. Feeder applications were submitted through county and State AAA committees.

From January 1 through September 30, 1944, over 182 million bushels of wheat were distributed to mixers, dealers, and feeders.

EXHIBIT E

C O P Y

April 8, 1957

C O P Y

TO: Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary

FROM: Deputy Administrator, Production Adjustment

SUBJECT: Improvements in State and County Committee Operations

1. Separation of policy-making and policy-execution functions in State and county ASC offices. In State and county ASC offices, policy-making functions have been assigned to the committees, and policy-execution functions and responsibility for day-to-day operations have been assigned to county office managers and State administrative officers. This method of operation enables each member of the team to perform the functions which he is best equipped to carry out.

2. Rotation of State committeemen. A rotation system for each State committee has been established under which one or more committeemen are replaced each year. This makes it possible to bring fresh and wider viewpoints to bear on State agricultural problems and, at the same time, insure stability and continuity of policies by retaining experienced members on the committee from one year to the next. In addition, clear-cut and effective policies have also been established on the composition of State committees and the qualifications, selection, and replacement of State committeemen.

3. State and county committeemen are no longer employed full time. In effect, State and county committees now serve as "Board of Directors" and determine policy. They do not spend their time on routine clerical and administrative matters which they are not necessarily well equipped to perform. This policy has made it possible for increased numbers of active farmers to serve on committees because committee service does not take them away from their farms every day.

4. Changes in election procedures. Numerous substantive changes in the procedure for electing community and county committeemen have stimulated more extensive farmer participation in the elections. The changes provide fair and impartial elections and eliminate the criticism which formerly had been frequently made to the effect that incumbent committeemen were utilizing the election machinery to perpetuate themselves in office contrary to the wishes of a majority of the electorate.

5. Classification and pay plan for county office employees. For the first time, a comprehensive nationwide classification and pay plan for county ASC employees has been developed and placed in operation. This fills a long recognized need of assuring equality of pay for county employees who are performing at the same levels of responsibility and workload. It has made possible the recruitment and retention of better qualified and more dedicated employees which inevitably will result in improved service to farmers.

6. The review of grade structure in State offices. The grades of State committeemen and State office employees have been reviewed in light of the tremendously increased responsibilities assigned to these offices in recent years. This has resulted in a major reclassification of the majority of positions in State offices, including State committeemen, State administrative officers, farmer fieldmen, auditors, and program specialists.

7. Improvement in the leave system for county office employees. The leave system for county office employees has been revised and expanded to provide benefits substantially equal to those accorded Federal employees. This has been of great assistance in getting and retaining high-caliber employees in county offices

8. Annual comprehensive audits. A system of annual comprehensive audits in every county and State office has been inaugurated. These internal audits have proved to be an effective management tool and have enabled the spotting of flaws and the making of procedural and organizational changes before serious problems arise.

9. Training. Much emphasis has been placed on the proper training of ASC county office managers and other employees before they are expected to assume the full responsibilities of their positions. A county office manager trainee program has also been inaugurated which provides a pool of qualified applicants who are available when vacancies occur in county offices. These measures are providing for greatly improved administrative efficiency and much better service to farmers.

10. Refinement in procedure system. A system of issuing CSS instructions in handbooks, which make available substantially all necessary instructions relating to a specific program or operation in one place, has been installed. Simultaneously, a major effort to improve the clarity and completeness of instructions and regulations has taken place. Further studies to improve the procedure system are currently under way.

11. Insurance for county office employees. The Department is currently supporting legislation to permit eligible county office employees to participate in the Federal Employees' Life Insurance Program. Studies also are under way for possible methods to permit county employees, as groups, to participate in hospitalization plans. These measures should add to the attractiveness of ASC county office employment.

/s/ H. L. Manwaring

EXHIBIT F

12/10/1957

ELIGIBILITY FOR APPOINTMENT AS ASC STATE COMMITTEEMEN

To be eligible for appointment to office as a farmer member of a State ASC committee, a person must:

1. Be a legal resident of the State;

2. Normally, derive over half of his income from farming; or spend a substantial portion of his time at farming;

3. Be actively engaged in farming as a farm operator; making decisions as to crops to be planted, land to be used, agronomic practices to be followed, etc.;

4. Be representative of a geographical agricultural area of the State not represented by any other member of the State committee;

5. Be engaged in a type of farming enterprise which when considered with other members of the State committee will give representation to the major types of farming in the State;

6. Have outstanding qualifications as a farmer or rancher, and as a leader in the State;

7. Have the ability to grasp and cope with complex agricultural programs and problems;

8. Not be, during his term of office, an officer or employee of a county, State, or national unit of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Farmers' Union, National Grange, or the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives;

9. Not be, during his term of office, an officer or employee of any political party or not participate actively in any political organization or campaign;

10. Not hold, during his term of office, any Federal, State, or major city or county office filled by an election held pursuant to law, or be, during his term of office, a candidate for such office.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION

STATE, COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Programs prescribed by the Congress under Sections 7-17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and such other acts of Congress as the Secretary of Agriculture or Congress may designate are administered by State, county and community committees with funds provided annually by the Congress. The conservation programs assist farmers in carrying out soil-building and soil and water conservation practices which maintain, protect and rebuild the Nation's soil resources. The adjustment programs help farmers to adjust production - upward or downward - by voluntary cooperative action to aid in providing an abundant and steady supply of farm products at prices fair to both farmers and consumers. Production goals, acreage allotments and marketing quotas are authorized for achieving these objectives. The State, county and community committees administer these programs and others, including the sugar program, commodity loan and purchase agreement programs, the grain storage structure program, and other Commodity Credit Corporation price support programs at the State, county and community levels.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Under law, the local administrative responsibility is placed with farmers through community, county, and State committees. Farmers participating in programs in the community elect annually from their number, a community committee of three members. The newly elected chairman or vice-chairman, respectively, of the community committee serves as the delegate to the county convention. These delegates elect from the farmers participating in the programs in the county, a county committee of three members. The county agent is an ex-officio member of the committee unless elected secretary of the committee. There are 27,204 community committees and 3,056 county committees.

A State committee, composed of not less than three or more than five farmers who are residents of the State, is appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the programs in the State with the aid of county and community committees. The State Director of the Agricultural Extension Service is an ex-officio member of the committee.

The 50 States and Puerto Rico are grouped into six areas. Each area is administered by an area director with supervisory responsibility over the programs and work of the committees within the area. States and territories comprising each area are:

Northeast Area - Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Southeast Area - Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Midwest Area - Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Southwest Area - Arizona, California, Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah.

Northwest Area - Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming.

Insular Area - Hawaii, Puerto Rico (including the Virgin Islands), and Alaska.

FUNCTIONS

Community committees provide local leadership and supervision in assisting the county committees in carrying out programs assigned to them. They inform the farmers of the purposes and provisions of programs and arrange for and conduct community meetings of program participants. In addition to the above, they perform such other duties as may be assigned by the office manager, under the direction of the county committees.

County committees under general direction and supervision of the State committees, and acting through the community committeemen and other personnel, are generally responsible for carrying out the programs assigned to them. In so doing the committee shall provide office space, equipment, supplies, and services to carry out assigned responsibilities; employ a county manager; fix rates of compensation for all personnel; direct the activities of the community committees; pursuant to instructions, review, approve, and certify forms, reports, and documents requiring such action, recommend changes in existing programs; and perform other duties prescribed by the State committee. The county manager, under the general direction of the county committee, is responsible for carrying out the policies of the committee, day to day operations of the office, employment of personnel, for property and funds accountability and supervision of the community committees and other personnel. County committeemen cooperate with other local agricultural agencies and leaders in integrating all farm programs.

The State committees carry out in the States the programs assigned to them. They are subject to the general direction and supervision of the Administrator, CSS, who acts through the Deputy Administrator, Production Adjustment and the Area Directors. The committees, in carrying out these responsibilities, determine program and administration policy, but the execution of such policy is carried out by the State Administrative Officers, employed by and responsible to the State committees. Through these officers, the committees supervise and coordinate the activities of the county committees, which include: (1) keeping local committeemen informed of the objectives, provisions, and progress of the farm programs: (2) determining results of programs; (3) preparing and submitting necessary reports; (4) conducting meetings and investigations; and (5) maintaining control of administrative and programs funds and expenditures. The State committees cooperate with other agricultural agencies and State leaders in integrating all farm programs.

Area Directors coordinate and supervise program activities for their area and cooperate with other agencies in integrating the provisions of all farm programs. They are responsible for keeping State committees informed of the objectives, provisions, and progress of farm programs. They interpret instructions and operating procedures; determine results of programs operative in the area; conduct meetings and investigations relating to programs; and assist the State committees to budget funds and account for expenditures in the area.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

I. Agricultural Conservation Program

Conservation Practices: Recommend to the county committee needed conservation practices and provisions needed in reference to an Agricultural Conservation Program for the county.

Performance: Assist farmers in reporting performance, and the county committee in verifying performance of certain conservation practices for which ACP assistance has been approved.

II. Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas

Allotments and Quotas: Recommend farm acreage allotments, assist in conducting referendums, and otherwise assist in administering programs.

Production Goals: When national production goals are in effect, assist in determining the community's share of county production goals and the facilities needed to attain them; and discuss with farmers the adjustments needed to attain such goals.

III. Loans and Other Price Support

Assist in administration of loan and other price support programs.

IV. Other Programs

Assist in administration of programs and activities as assigned.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM FUNCTIONS OF COUNTY COMMITTEE

I. Agricultural Conservation Program

Jointly with Agricultural Conservation Program Service, SCS and Forest Service and in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, develop an Agricultural Conservation Program to help

meet county conservation needs; recommend to the State committee regarding policies needed in reference to a State and National Agricultural Conservation Program, giving due consideration to the opinions and recommendations of other agricultural agencies in the county; review farmers' requests for ACP assistance and allot the available ACP assistance funds for the county to individual practices on participating farms; and direct the issuance of conservation assistance either as conservation materials and services or as cash reimbursement for a part of the costs incurred.

II. Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas

Allotments and Quotas: Obtain basic data, determine acreage allotments, and conduct referendums. If farmers vote quotas into effect, measure planted acreages; issue marketing cards; obtain and audit records of production and sales; determine and report violations; and determine, collect, and make appropriate disposition of penalties.

Production Goals: When national production goals are in effect, develop county goal programs with the cooperation of other local agricultural agencies and initiate and carry out measures necessary to encourage and assist farmers to produce in accordance with announced goals.

III. Loans and Other Price Support

Determine eligibility of producers; determine storage needs and approve storage facilities; supervise the erection, maintenance and sale of CCC storage bins; inspect and sample loan commodities to determine quantity, grade, and loan value; provide for liquidation of loans; arrange for grading, storing and shipping commodities acquired by Government; and assist producers and handlers in working out methods of marketing.

IV. Sugar Program

Acquaint the farmers and sugar company employees with the provisions of the Sugar Act program; determine eligibility of producers for conditional payments; recommend areas in which adjusted payments should be made due to partial or total crop failure; make acreage determinations for proportionate shares compliance; determine whether there have been any child labor violations; prepare and check applications for payments and transmit to State office; and handle and attempt to settle wage claims.

V. Emergency and Other Programs

Be generally responsible for carrying out in the county other programs that are assigned; inform farmers of the objectives and provisions of such programs; and recommend to the State committee provisions relating to such programs.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM FUNCTIONS OF STATE COMMITTEE

I. Agricultural Conservation Program

Jointly with Agricultural Conservation Program Service, SCS and Forest Service and in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, develop an Agricultural Conservation Program to help meet the State conservation needs; jointly with Agricultural Conservation Program Service, SCS and Forest Service, and in consultation with other agricultural agencies, recommend to the Secretary policies needed for a national ACP; apportion the State ACP fund to counties; supervise the development and administration of county ACP; assist county committees in the procurement and purchasing of necessary conservation materials and services.

II. Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas

Allotments and Quotas: Review and record basic farm data; determine, appraise and adjust allotments and yields; certify results of referendums; spot check acreage measurements; instruct county and community committees, warehousemen, buyers, dealers and others concerning provisions of program; review and approve farm quotas; supervise administration of quota program; schedule penalty collections to appropriate account; audit and certify claims for refunds; prepare reports on violations; and recommend marketing quota review committees for appointment by the Secretary.

Production Goals: When national production goals are in effect, review preliminary goals and develop State programs with the cooperation of other agricultural agencies, to encourage and assist farmers to produce in accordance with announced goals.

III. Loans and Other Price Support: Approve acceptable types of storage structures; recommend kind of supports which should be used; determine grade and grade factors for commodities on which loans are to be made; supervise acquisition and sale of CCC bins and equipment; establish policy for reinspection of loan commodities; and supervise the storage and shipment of commodities acquired by Government.

IV. Sugar Program: Supervise the county offices in the administration of the sugar program; review, schedule, and certify sugar applications to Disbursing Office for payment; approve areas in which adjusted payments should be made due to partial or total crop failure; and recommend to the Secretary changes and improvements in the sugar program.

V. Emergency and Other Programs: Be generally responsible for carrying out in the State other programs that are assigned; supervise and develop such programs for State; recommend to the Administrator changes in the programs; and keep the county committees informed of the progress and the provisions of such programs.

EMPLOYMENT

I. Community Committees

There were 78,772 community committeemen elected in 1959. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, they worked 354 man-years or an average of 1.2 days each. Their average daily wage was $10.20 and their average earnings for the fiscal year $12.00.

II. County Committees

There were 9,159 county committeemen elected in 1959. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, they worked 1,378 man-years or an average of 39 days each. Their average daily wage was $12.60 and their average earnings for the fiscal year $493.00.

All other workers of the county committees other than committeemen worked 25,942 man-years in the fiscal year 1959. Their average earnings for the fiscal year was $3412. An average of 8.88 man-years of all other help was employed by each county committee.

III. Forty-nine State committees maintain a State office in each of 49 States. Puerto Rico and Hawaii each have an office. Employment in the 51 offices during the fiscal year 1959 amounted to 2093.0 man-years including 1941.4 man-years of permanent, 61.2 man-years of "when actually employed" and part time, and 90.4 man years of temporary employees. Average employment per office was about 42 man-years. The average "General Schedule" grade was 6.1. The average earnings per man-year were $5,338.

FUNDS

I. State committee activities are financed from Administrative Expenses, Section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. This appropriation account is made up of various appropriations for specific programs which are transferred to it.

II. County and community committeemen activities are financed from Local Administration, Section 388, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. This appropriation account is made up of various appropriations for specific programs which are transferred to it.

Budget Division - CSS
April 5, 1955
Revised July 1960

1956-60 CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM: CONTRACTS AND RENTAL OBLIGATIONS ON 1956-60 ACRES AS REPORTED THROUGH MARCH 15, 1960 1/

SHEET 1 of 2

STATE	CONTRACTS: TOTAL NUMBER	CONTRACTS: WHOLE FARMS	CONTRACTS: PERCENT WHOLE FARMS	ANNUAL RENTAL PAYMENT OBLIGATION (DOLLARS): TOTAL	BY TYPE OF CONTRACT: WHOLE FARMS	BY TYPE OF CONTRACT: PART FARMS REGULAR	BY TYPE OF CONTRACT: PART FARMS NON-DIVERSION	BY EXPIRATION DATE (DECEMBER 31): 1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	TOTAL RENTAL OBLIGATION PER ACRE	1956-58 BASIC RATE PER ACRE	1959-60 BASIC RATE PER ACRE	AVERAGE LENGTH OF CONTRACT NUMBER OF YEARS	STATE
	-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-	-8-	-9-	-10-	-11-	-12-	-13-	-14-	-15-	-16-	-17-	-18-	-19-	-20-	-21-	
ALABAMA	8,217	5,459	66.4	4,950,082	3,613,099	1,306,872	30,111	1,570	103,817	43,534	1,031,644	442,432	3,359	222,296	378,869	1,659,621	1,063,000	12.34	8.00	12.00	7.44	ALABAMA
ARIZONA	66	47	71.2	101,126	70,505	30,621	—	—	60,233	6,378	6,900	—	—	21,840	5,775	—	—	13.67	9.00	10.00	3.62	ARIZONA
ARKANSAS	9,552	7,578	79.3	7,280,370	5,682,139	1,564,263	33,968	15,856	309,196	249,142	2,446,974	997,158	11,630	90,812	300,111	1,936,253	923,238	12.04	9.00	13.50	6.31	ARKANSAS
CALIFORNIA	1,091	717	65.7	2,642,674	1,602,014	952,754	87,906	39,558	214,773	96,928	1,232,759	424,549	30,302	22,138	18,564	441,129	121,974	12.84	12.00	16.00	5.10	CALIFORNIA
COLORADO	4,690	2,706	57.7	9,716,184	6,212,039	3,446,715	57,430	3,089	891,977	365,265	1,197,446	179,998	25,924	1,279,424	579,060	4,513,163	680,838	7.67	8.00	9.00	7.18	COLORADO
CONNECTICUT	199	181	91.0	93,241	89,207	2,695	1,339	482	2,561	556	56,875	12,118	217	244	1,032	11,069	8,087	19.40	13.00	20.00	5.22	CONNECTICUT
DELAWARE	284	244	85.9	306,590	283,864	22,401	325	201	5,918	1,586	148,272	51,549	1,521	3,094	2,439	84,255	7,765	16.66	12.00	16.00	5.72	DELAWARE
FLORIDA	2,199	1,260	57.3	2,213,059	1,474,181	712,059	26,859	—	67,852	31,192	124,900	178,816	2,452	376,477	214,321	664,969	552,120	9.57	8.00	12.00	7.90	FLORIDA
GEORGIA	15,159	9,045	59.7	12,000,827	7,917,816	3,780,041	102,970	6,212	193,804	131,608	1,208,596	791,873	16,069	856,314	1,748,991	4,259,731	2,788,129	11.42	8.00	12.00	7.99	GEORGIA
IDAHO	1,534	1,230	80.2	3,517,952	2,877,082	578,031	62,839	3,379	168,073	80,654	1,243,379	523,000	28,734	51,286	19,961	950,124	449,362	12.03	11.00	14.50	6.13	IDAHO
ILLINOIS	6,157	5,454	88.6	7,599,598	7,022,239	568,832	8,527	7,900	203,426	47,381	4,836,784	1,500,206	19,472	36,097	12,991	726,469	208,872	17.24	12.00	19.00	4.80	ILLINOIS
INDIANA	7,837	7,032	89.7	8,993,996	8,397,869	582,148	13,979	17,729	344,970	72,071	5,038,964	2,090,431	73,941	20,591	7,989	931,271	396,039	18.40	12.00	19.00	4.95	INDIANA
IOWA	7,690	6,226	81.0	11,878,533	10,791,029	1,082,070	5,434	55,159	872,273	250,009	6,854,883	2,840,159	98,191	18,729	16,917	606,227	265,986	18.10	12.00	19.00	4.47	IOWA
KANSAS	12,631	7,050	55.8	17,162,069	11,753,660	5,383,588	24,821	20,706	922,377	969,513	4,301,878	1,324,587	116,046	902,324	1,103,532	4,694,845	2,806,061	11.92	10.00	12.50	6.69	KANSAS
KENTUCKY	5,324	4,502	84.6	6,060,237	5,671,288	344,610	44,339	6,177	142,477	65,806	2,891,697	918,564	21,120	156,662	30,961	1,524,814	442,965	16.22	10.00	15.00	5.82	KENTUCKY
LOUISIANA	3,248	2,540	78.2	2,905,075	2,265,726	601,353	41,996	1,480	55,639	30,877	750,813	337,426	5,831	96,752	411,310	920,380	298,367	13.56	10.00	14.00	6.93	LOUISIANA
MAINE	2,713	2,349	86.6	1,442,614	1,328,412	99,387	14,815	3,856	95,151	99,752	243,613	193,138	1,991	12,809	160,692	375,110	316,501	11.52	9.00	12.00	6.85	MAINE
MARYLAND	1,494	1,273	85.2	1,443,603	1,325,847	110,336	7,420	6,916	132,459	46,292	746,785	221,367	2,957	15,576	17,208	183,650	70,393	16.96	12.00	17.00	4.94	MARYLAND
MASSACHUSETTS	115	99	86.1	46,242	43,308	1,736	1,198	466	1,314	456	21,031	7,042	427	385	1,012	8,932	5,177	15.56	13.00	19.00	5.82	MASSACHUSETTS
MICHIGAN	11,649	10,411	89.4	9,394,756	8,966,283	387,940	40,533	117,661	492,892	205,561	3,871,231	2,151,906	17,618	81,056	67,754	1,262,871	1,126,206	13.12	11.00	15.00	5.51	MICHIGAN
MINNESOTA	20,762	15,043	72.5	21,862,223	17,009,716	4,797,559	54,948	303,505	2,360,653	2,014,818	7,333,340	2,097,329	81,696	1,999,450	1,486,748	3,085,390	1,099,294	11.24	11.00	14.50	5.31	MINNESOTA
MISSISSIPPI	5,842	2,872	49.2	4,548,500	1,946,035	2,585,129	17,336	94,950	375,923	300,597	1,767,023	395,088	14,032	163,129	200,603	893,675	343,480	13.54	10.00	14.00	5.52	MISSISSIPPI
MISSOURI	10,894	7,968	73.1	11,748,235	9,945,840	1,790,206	12,189	16,650	501,375	448,420	4,547,485	2,328,794	31,315	53,954	40,525	2,614,462	1,165,255	14.13	9.00	14.00	5.81	MISSOURI
MONTANA	1,992	1,478	74.2	5,523,335	4,463,068	966,093	94,174	2,861	317,612	138,958	1,419,658	498,449	24,253	127,296	166,483	1,856,078	1,031,687	9.11	9.00	10.00	6.96	MONTANA
NEBRASKA	7,392	5,212	70.5	10,470,571	8,827,901	1,614,371	28,299	13,198	532,354	210,308	4,300,109	1,726,575	29,367	112,200	78,419	2,512,729	955,312	11.98	9.00	12.50	5.85	NEBRASKA
NEVADA	1	—	—	91	—	91	—	—	91	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.00	7.00	10.00	2.00	NEVADA
NEW HAMPSHIRE	456	408	89.5	158,041	155,611	85	2,345	141	356	351	17,742	7,229	—	575	5,528	70,670	55,449	13.27	10.00	13.00	8.53	NEW HAMPSHIRE
NEW JERSEY	1,089	893	82.0	888,143	764,164	117,834	6,145	4,494	41,716	22,423	482,892	259,616	276	3,861	2,021	35,687	35,159	17.54	13.00	19.00	4.62	NEW JERSEY
NEW MEXICO	3,505	2,152	61.4	7,049,874	3,976,777	3,071,500	1,597	3,777	713,223	118,365	117,258	1,188	2,040,355	2,513,711	918,039	620,319	2,339	5.15	[illegible]	8.00	6.39	NEW MEXICO
NEW YORK	9,687	8,314	85.8	6,561,138	6,029,083	488,199	43,856	59,225	393,261	199,692	1,966,134	999,445	13,250	69,734	133,377	1,519,391	1,207,629	12.83	11.00	15.00	6.35	NEW YORK
NORTH CAROLINA	7,789	4,580	58.8	4,074,212	2,962,570	1,072,049	39,593	3,811	59,927	53,252	1,105,990	895,718	5,374	197,004	234,387	1,082,400	436,349	15.18	10.00	16.00	6.52	NORTH CAROLINA
NORTH DAKOTA	12,141	7,634	62.9	26,641,218	19,308,452	7,275,541	57,225	54,196	2,182,257	1,443,761	5,689,061	3,881,351	73,587	1,864,603	1,139,455	5,175,833	5,137,126	16.01	9.00	10.50	6.44	NORTH DAKOTA
OHIO	8,905	8,089	90.8	8,936,538	8,544,816	375,559	16,163	26,594	385,323	116,853	4,339,527	2,384,002	25,935	20,840	12,705	841,271	783,488	17.19	12.00	19.00	5.17	OHIO
OKLAHOMA	16,893	9,716	57.5	15,771,378	10,258,619	5,471,682	41,077	14,386	1,558,907	946,430	3,802,584	1,622,201	42,537	1,327,887	829,427	3,439,779	2,187,240	10.72	9.00	[illegible]	6.23	OKLAHOMA
OREGON	2,278	1,497	65.7	3,319,246	2,198,915	1,015,915	104,416	49,101	280,649	145,123	1,273,310	473,262	20,117	109,625	94,149	545,874	328,036	14.37	12.00	16.00	5.53	OREGON
PENNSYLVANIA	7,392	6,631	89.7	5,756,008	5,475,920	255,965	24,123	52,189	278,982	123,064	2,431,718	1,275,139	9,987	26,527	37,390	743,627	777,391	15.43	11.00	16.00	5.58	PENNSYLVANIA
RHODE ISLAND	4	4	100.0	1,233	1,233	—	—	—	361	—	209	498	—	—	—	165	—	19.89	12.00	19.00	4.49	RHODE ISLAND
SOUTH CAROLINA	11,893	7,089	59.6	8,101,488	5,349,860	2,695,149	56,479	3,458	121,235	59,389	726,166	685,347	5,818	279,261	813,592	3,621,322	1,785,950	12.74	9.00	13.50	8.11	SOUTH CAROLINA
SOUTH DAKOTA	10,972	6,846	62.4	18,560,661	13,612,869	4,929,324	18,468	55,173	1,736,241	998,749	4,854,136	3,554,978	67,842	426,212	306,272	3,620,225	2,301,133	14.27	9.00	11.00	6.01	SOUTH DAKOTA
TENNESSEE	7,886	5,772	73.2	7,318,797	6,355,673	929,581	33,543	3,916	208,401	197,599	2,348,710	1,100,821	22,091	121,914	214,631	1,991,768	1,108,952	14.97	10.00	14.00	6.51	TENNESSEE
TEXAS	33,769	16,874	50.0	38,718,443	19,217,272	19,462,781	38,390	58,357	7,589,824	2,426,448	7,349,826	2,638,618	2,055,747	4,821,070	2,147,851	6,853,199	2,777,493	10.64	10.00	12.00	5.63	TEXAS
UTAH	954	603	63.2	2,051,895	1,394,300	582,634	74,961	2,072	231,280	61,035	389,715	113,891	7,171	400,145	92,529	557,947	196,110	8.63	11.00	12.00	6.50	UTAH
VERMONT	1,019	912	89.5	446,135	440,171	1,572	4,392	126	404	582	59,709	35,038	2,909	1,981	19,493	196,297	129,496	13.25	10.00	14.00	8.22	VERMONT
VIRGINIA	2,404	2,024	84.2	1,852,834	1,717,034	124,219	11,581	4,243	136,955	21,742	689,536	356,716	17,451	24,658	18,509	366,284	216,740	15.93	10.00	16.00	5.82	VIRGINIA
WASHINGTON	2,200	1,608	73.1	4,232,928	2,710,302	1,150,751	371,875	20,966	128,720	186,884	1,512,160	540,218	44,273	37,118	127,272	1,197,167	438,150	12.70	13.00	16.00	6.21	WASHINGTON
WEST VIRGINIA	1,821	1,752	96.2	887,975	870,611	12,633	4,231	1,859	19,989	12,238	344,667	176,636	4,923	1,204	21,697	204,921	99,841	15.10	10.00	14.00	6.08	WEST VIRGINIA
WISCONSIN	12,666	11,375	89.8	10,517,665	9,970,798	517,831	29,036	71,393	599,762	202,224	4,520,918	2,412,808	11,567	153,776	100,853	1,315,500	1,128,864	13.71	11.00	15.00	5.43	WISCONSIN
WYOMING	548	369	67.3	1,080,868	819,330	248,991	12,547	2,803	128,079	27,078	282,393	91,016	—	27,947	12,239	387,992	121,321	8.71	8.00	9.00	6.41	WYOMING
U.S.	305,003	213,118	69.9	336,832,041	251,714,547	83,311,696	1,805,798	1,232,123	26,165,243	13,270,938	101,927,400	45,738,500	5,129,675	19,009,528	14,233,123	71,155,555	38,969,956	11.85	10.00	13.50	6.05	U.S.

1/ THIS SUMMARIZES STATE PROGRESS REPORTS FROM THE NEW ORLEANS DATA PROCESSING CENTER.

C 65-SOIL BANK DIVISION
4-12-60

1956-60 CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM: ACRES FOR 1956-60 BY TYPE OF CONTRACT AND CONSERVATION TREATMENT REQUIRED AS REPORTED THROUGH MARCH 15, 1960 1/

STATE	1956-60 RESERVE ACRES BY TYPE OF CONTRACT: TOTAL	WHOLE FARMS	PART FARMS: REGULAR RATE	PART FARMS: NON-DIVERSION RATE	RESERVE ACRES IN COVER TO BE MAINTAINED	RESERVE ACRES REQUIRING CONSERVATION COVER TO BE ESTABLISHED: TOTAL ACRES OF COVER TO BE ESTABLISHED	A-1 GRASS COST SHARE ACRES	ACRES OF COVER AT NO COST TO C.R.	A-7 + A-8 TREE COST SHARE ACRES	B-7, C-14 + G-3 WATER CONSERVATION COST SHARE: ACRES	NUMBER OF PONDS (ESTIMATED)	G-1 WILDLIFE COVER ACRES	G-2 WILDLIFE WATER & MARSH MANAGEMENT: COST SHARE ACRES	STRUCTURES (ESTIMATED)	PERCENT OF RESERVE ACRES 2/: ON WHOLE FARMS (33 ÷ 32)	ON PART FARMS REGULAR RATE (34 ÷ 32)	ON PART FARMS NON-DIVERSION RATE (35 ÷ 32)	PRESENT COVER TO BE MAINTAINED (26 ÷ 32)	NEW COVER TO BE ESTABLISHED (27 ÷ 32)	STATE
	-22-	-23-	-24-	-25-	-26-	-27-	-28-	-29-	-30-	-31-	-32-	-33-	-34-	-35-	-36-	-37-	-38-	-39-	-40-	
ALABAMA	401,100	274,884	120,224	5,992	18,857	382,243	161,903	2,726	215,744	295	111	1,556	25	3	68.5	30.0	1.5	4.7	95.3	ALABAMA
ARIZONA	7,397	5,215	2,182	-	24	7,373	7,373	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.5	29.5	-	0.3	99.7	ARIZONA
ARKANSAS	604,630	479,397	118,811	6,422	203,743	400,887	298,983	452	97,004	1,862	134	912	1,674	37	79.3	19.6	1.1	33.7	66.3	ARKANSAS
CALIFORNIA	205,269	119,564	73,877	12,327	85,131	120,637	93,926	22,667	25	7	6	1,560	2,452	18	58.1	35.9	6.0	41.4	58.6	CALIFORNIA
COLORADO	1,267,215	800,304	451,179	15,732	20,359	1,246,856	1,243,722	1,878	925	33	18	278	20	2	63.2	35.6	1.2	1.6	98.4	COLORADO
CONNECTICUT	4,807	4,521	149	137	3,464	1,343	955	41	336	1	1	10	-	-	94.1	3.1	2.8	72.1	27.9	CONNECTICUT
DELAWARE	18,404	16,877	1,486	41	5,445	12,959	11,969	85	756	4	6	145	3/	2	91.7	8.1	0.2	29.6	70.4	DELAWARE
FLORIDA	231,295	141,454	83,461	6,380	11,926	219,369	53,060	181	165,431	15	5	682	—		61.2	36.1	3.7	5.2	94.8	FLORIDA
GEORGIA	1,050,686	641,389	389,565	19,732	53,547	997,139	305,431	514	688,834	259	84	1,991	110	6	61.0	37.1	1.9	5.1	94.9	GEORGIA
IDAHO	292,538	227,812	51,074	13,652	52,910	239,628	237,607	53	1,960	4	3	404	100	1	77.9	17.4	4.7	18.1	81.9	IDAHO
ILLINOIS	440,816	405,483	34,217	1,116	101,205	339,611	331,024	1,468	4,045	150	101	2,924	-	-	92.0	7.8	0.2	23.0	77.0	ILLINOIS
INDIANA	488,826	452,263	34,519	2,044	212,252	276,574	263,723	3,898	2,389	400	138	6,030	134	9	92.5	7.1	0.4	43.4	56.6	INDIANA
IOWA	656,221	583,974	71,432	815	309,709	346,512	263,836	77,432	4,580	641	154	23	-	-	89.0	10.9	0.1	47.2	52.8	IOWA
KANSAS	1,439,857	947,764	486,764	5,329	76,736	1,363,121	1,351,020	6,261	313	53	39	242	232	20	65.8	32.8	0.4	5.3	94.7	KANSAS
KENTUCKY	375,593	341,982	24,535	7,076	142,042	231,551	224,423	1,906	4,052	729	551	441	-	-	91.5	6.6	1.9	38.0	62.0	KENTUCKY
LOUISIANA	214,516	168,086	39,621	6,809	65,487	149,029	56,972	1,663	88,082	1,369	97	281	662	18	78.3	18.5	3.2	30.5	69.5	LOUISIANA
MAINE	125,225	113,309	8,205	3,711	73,174	52,051	34,790	86	17,175	-	-	-	-	-	90.5	6.5	3.0	58.4	41.6	MAINE
MARYLAND	85,115	70,654	7,474	989	48,374	36,741	27,214	189	3,261	27	21	6,047	3	2	90.0	8.8	1.2	56.8	43.2	MARYLAND
MASSACHUSETTS	2,971	2,680	94	197	2,101	870	354	-	516	-	-	-	-	-	90.2	3.2	6.6	70.7	29.3	MASSACHUSETTS
MICHIGAN	716,041	675,131	30,784	10,126	497,282	218,759	149,008	34,381	30,809	361	46	4,085	115	27	94.3	4.3	1.4	69.4	30.6	MICHIGAN
MINNESOTA	1,945,674	1,485,557	444,221	15,896	742,101	1,203,573	1,165,638	9,814	27,725	4	3	127	65	3	76.4	22.8	0.8	38.1	61.9	MINNESOTA
MISSISSIPPI	335,991	145,737	187,220	3,034	73,717	262,274	193,979	1,676	65,170	294	24	1,044	111	5	43.4	55.7	0.9	21.9	78.1	MISSISSIPPI
MISSOURI	831,340	684,150	144,542	2,648	331,139	500,201	478,277	12,263	3,098	3,898	2,270	179	2,486	274	82.3	17.4	0.3	39.8	60.2	MISSOURI
MONTANA	606,142	479,347	105,643	21,152	66,409	539,733	536,056	2,207	1,209	7	3	254	-	-	79.1	17.4	3.5	11.0	89.0	MONTANA
NEBRASKA	873,656	702,682	164,504	6,470	175,755	697,901	679,592	17,178	930	32	13	169	-	-	80.4	18.8	0.8	20.1	79.9	NEBRASKA
NEVADA	13	-	13	-	-	13	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	100.0	NEVADA
NEW HAMPSHIRE	11,911	11,396	8	507	7,040	4,871	112	-	4,704	54	25	1	-	-	95.7	0.1	4.2	59.1	40.9	NEW HAMPSHIRE
NEW JERSEY	50,627	43,254	6,682	691	24,871	25,756	24,525	667	455	4	4	105	-	-	85.4	13.2	1.4	49.1	50.9	NEW JERSEY
NEW MEXICO	865,404	499,280	365,601	523	1,748	863,656	863,300	356	-	-	-	-	-	-	57.7	42.2	0.1	0.2	99.8	NEW MEXICO
NEW YORK	511,386	464,289	37,923	9,174	359,895	151,491	93,023	3,177	53,712	1,162	789	354	63	17	90.8	7.4	1.8	70.4	29.6	NEW YORK
NORTH CAROLINA	268,307	182,339	79,697	6,271	49,128	219,179	77,017	33,192	107,193	515	401	1,248	14	4	68.0	29.7	2.3	18.3	81.7	NORTH CAROLINA
NORTH DAKOTA	2,661,348	1,919,411	727,745	14,192	236,810	2,424,538	2,338,135	7,137	53,345	2	1	13,048	871	23	72.1	27.4	0.5	8.9	91.1	NORTH DAKOTA
OHIO	519,872	492,581	24,326	2,945	314,499	205,373	155,084	26,226	2,514	503	258	20,994	52	9	94.7	4.7	0.6	60.5	39.5	OHIO
OKLAHOMA	1,471,573	909,863	551,895	9,815	132,947	1,338,626	1,276,478	2,354	2,467	198	75	57,083	46	1	61.8	37.5	0.7	9.0	91.0	OKLAHOMA
OREGON	235,926	143,146	76,850	15,910	70,626	165,280	152,565	581	6,438	20	14	5,162	514	61	60.7	32.6	6.7	29.9	70.1	OREGON
PENNSYLVANIA	373,137	351,139	17,770	4,228	299,940	73,197	50,259	11,051	11,399	200	89	285	3	1	94.1	4.8	1.1	80.4	19.6	PENNSYLVANIA
RHODE ISLAND	62	62	-	-	37	25	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	59.7	40.3	RHODE ISLAND
SOUTH CAROLINA	635,722	401,276	224,644	9,862	98,077	537,705	145,892	26,677	362,100	89	52	773	2,174	26	63.1	35.3	1.6	15.4	84.6	SOUTH CAROLINA
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,807,683	1,277,233	526,192	4,258	354,939	1,452,744	1,433,999	2,271	2,958	13	20	13,466	37	14	70.7	29.1	0.2	19.6	80.4	SOUTH DAKOTA
TENNESSEE	489,058	409,019	72,884	7,155	123,112	365,946	312,737	3,789	47,107	1,219	763	529	565	11	83.6	14.9	1.5	25.2	74.8	TENNESSEE
TEXAS	3,639,465	1,724,066	1,907,871	7,528	408,433	3,231,032	3,092,916	34,061	64,740	185	182	39,136	-	-	47.4	52.4	0.2	11.2	88.8	TEXAS
UTAH	237,441	163,453	56,148	18,040	21,744	215,897	214,837	988	72	-	-	-	-	-	68.8	23.6	7.6	9.1	90.9	UTAH
VERMONT	33,662	32,394	129	139	20,170	13,492	183	342	12,913	51	38	-	3	2	96.2	0.4	3.4	59.9	40.1	VERMONT
VIRGINIA	116,287	105,745	8,756	1,786	72,565	43,722	25,138	3,872	14,316	56	27	334	6	1	91.0	7.5	1.5	62.4	37.6	VIRGINIA
WASHINGTON	333,207	185,730	88,122	59,355	98,539	234,668	179,405	245	39,941	15	5	50,648	414	7	55.7	26.5	17.8	29.6	70.4	WASHINGTON
WEST VIRGINIA	58,786	57,280	843	663	49,407	9,379	4,156	118	4,377	88	52	39	1	1	97.5	1.4	1.1	84.0	16.0	WEST VIRGINIA
WISCONSIN	767,135	717,159	43,744	6,232	497,249	269,886	229,816	9,734	28,606	59	17	1,643	28	20	93.5	5.7	0.8	64.8	35.2	WISCONSIN
WYOMING	124,110	89,617	31,164	3,329	28,680	95,430	91,944	3,412	74	-	-	-	-	-	72.2	25.1	2.7	23.1	76.9	WYOMING
U. S.	28,432,186	20,155,946	7,924,790	351,450	6,643,345	21,788,841	18,937,194	369,269	2,159,500	14,878	6,640	294,220	12,980	625	70.9	27.9	1.2	23.4	76.6	U. S.

1/ THIS SUMMARIZES STATE PROGRESS REPORTS FROM THE NEW ORLEANS DATA PROCESSING CENTER.

2/ COLUMNS 36, 37 AND 38 ARE DUPLICATED IN COLUMNS 39 AND 40

3/ LESS THAN 0.5 ACRE

CSS - SOIL BANK DIVISION

4-15-60

EXHIBIT K

EXHIBIT J

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Commodity Credit Corporation

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Barley:	Bushels	
1940	7,499	2,391
1941	16,297	6,860
1942	15,199	8,152
1943	761	558
1944	3,302	2,799
1945	1,027	758
1946	491	374
1947	337	322
1948	31,752	35,748
1949	28,507	31,253
1950	29,629	33,020
1951	16,326	17,411
1952	7,501	8,736
1953	36,376	42,647
1954	100,977	112,232
1955	78,533	67,711
1956	64,386	61,225
1957	121,626	106,188
1958	89,144	78,680
1959	2,522	2,158
Total	652,192	619,223
Beans, Dry:	Cwt.	
1943	455	2,544
1947	1	6
1948	4,048	33,104
1949	7,214	51,069
1950	1,348	9,205
1951	2,558	18,953
1952	1,588	13,199
1953	3,352	27,282
1954	3,485	25,542
1955	2,844	18,661
1956	3,542	24,230
1957	2,228	14,240
1958	3,206	20,827
Total	35,869	258,862
Butter:	Pounds	
1938	114,264	29,095
1939	12,836	3,042
1940	66	19
Total	127,166	32,156

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Corn:	Bushels	
1933	267,762	121,276
1934	20,075	11,042
1935	30,966	13,934
1936	158	87
1937 (Fall of 1937)	47,117	22,871
1937 (Fall of 1938)	14,000 2/	7,980 2/
1938	229,839	130,882
1939	301,729	171,756
1940	103,125	62,835
1941	110,871	80,914
1942	56,401	43,605
1943	7,895	6,648
1944	20,647	18,439
1945	2,996	2,768
1946	25,982	28,140
1947	1,135	1,482
1948	376,759	524,470
1949	331,539	445,944
1950	51,590	72,489
1951	25,207	39,854
1952	314,926	492,756
1953	376,744	588,982
1954	203,671	320,797
1955	361,214	559,694
1956	406,136	577,308
1957	322,794	396,281
1958	343,921	406,074
Total	4,355,199	5,149,308
Cotton:	Bales	
1933	1,926	99,498
1934	4,632	282,644
1933-34 Pool 3/	--	51,416
1935	115	5,777
1937	5,581	243,275
1938	4,482	205,329
1939	30	1,324
1940	3,180	153,140
1941	2,221	153,012
1942	3,143	290,762
1943	3,594	342,424
1944	2,122	218,279
1945	216	22,285
1946	145	17,761

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Cotton: (Cont'd.)	Bales	
1947	280	36,688
1948	5,272	822,634
1949	3,190	458,867
1950	8	1,656
1951	1,115	171,801
1952	2,307	369,177
1953	6,832	1,168,784
1954	2,309	396,897
1955	7,257	1,198,119
1956	4,830	767,599
1957	3,658	490,488
1958	6,832	1,172,431
Total	75,277	9,142,067
Cottonseed:	Tons	
1949	7.9	392
1951	.4	25
1952	.4	25
1953	1.4	72
1954	.1	4
1955	.2	9
1956	.8	38
1957	.1	6
1958	2.3	102
Total	13.6	673
Dates:	Pounds	
1937	1,533	61
Figs:	Tons	
1937	4.2	84
1938	7.4	125
1939	3.0	51
Total	14.6	260
Fiber Flax:	Pounds	
1946	2,579	1,237

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Flaxseed:	Bushels	
1941	749	1,245
1942	1,576	3,488
1943	595	1,581
1944	60	168
1945	129	368
1946	24	67
1947	527	2,522
1948	1,365	7,776
1949	9,417	35,299
1950	896	2,266
1951	1,806	4,685
1952	3,818	14,149
1953	15,457	57,454
1954	7,257	22,166
1955	7,100	20,053
1956	14,605	43,952
1957	2,463	7,071
1958	11,956	32,865
Total	79,800	257,175
Grain Sorghum:	Cwt.	
1940	44	23
1941	191	117
1942	68	66
1943	26	39
1944	4,601	7,741
1945	6	9
1946	309	496
1947	42	85
1948	19,409	48,069
1949	43,755	99,841
1950	33,292	64,846
1951	8,310	16,585
1952	1,851	4,167
1953	23,855	57,561
1954	62,116	148,115
1955	57,541	100,655
1956	21,807	42,934
1957	155,407	306,020
1958	148,161	280,056
Total	580,791	1,177,425

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Honey:	Pounds	
1952	9,290	1,061
1953	3,124	334
1954	1,465	153
1955	1,863	181
1956	1,640	149
1957	2,913	290
1958	5,634	537
1959	104	7
Total	26,033	2,712
Hops:	Pounds	
1938	7,077	1,388
Naval Stores:	Pounds	
Rosin: 1934	109,540	2,089
1935	43,894	866
1938	401,897	9,861
1939	296,087	7,603
1940	264,535	6,001
1941	69,100	1,576
1942	179,700	5,438
1943	3,398	120
1947	1,446	87
1948	222,915	17,846
1949	181,932	12,432
1950	140	7
1951	21,716	1,624
1952	163,809	12,428
1953	66,013	4,983
1954	30,666	2,324
1956	60	5
1957	29,590	2,249
1958	9,013	717
1959	24	4
Total	2,095,475	88,260
Turpentine:	Gallons	
1934	5,028	2,403
1935	3,024	1,418
1938	9,368	1,908
1939	6,123	1,213
1940	2,940	627
1942	7,624	4,177
1943	4	3
1947	2,786	1,741

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Turpentine: (Cont'd.)	Gallons	
1948	3,785	1,894
1949	3,283	1,364
1951	279	142
1952	2,706	1,400
1953	1,632	847
1954	733	376
1957	439	230
1958	174	88
1959	19	9
Total	49,947	19,840
Oats:	Bushels	
1945	2,933	1,275
1946	788	364
1947	244	141
1948	15,098	9,917
1949	30,394	20,293
1950	14,611	9,899
1951	12,820	8,701
1952	17,595	13,130
1953	46,296	36,518
1954	64,656	48,581
1955	56,364	33,817
1956	34,200	23,118
1957	49,301	28,206
1958	71,853	40,086
1959	486	257
Total	417,639	274,303
Olive Oil:	Gallons	
1943	121	457
1951	380	902
1952	545	1,252
Total	1,046	2,611
Peanuts:	Tons	
1937	86.3	5,267
1938	121.4	7,035
1939	13.1	817
1940	29.4	1,867
1944	125.7	21,242
1945	154.5	25,603
1946	200.2	34,284
1947	191.5	37,418

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS, FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Peanuts: (Cont'd.)	Tons	
1948	241.6	50,587
1949	172.4	33,440
1950	275.8	54,094
1951	126.4	25,289
1952	53.6	11,773
1953	228.6	48,473
1954	7.2	1,477
1955	149.8	34,073
1956	183.0	39,640
1957	121.6	24,591
1958	132.0	26,838
Total	2,614.1	483,808
Peas, Dry:	Cwt.	
1943	43	182
1944	52	208
1948	1	5
1949	750	2,310
Total	846	2,705
Pecans:	Pounds	
1938	3,706	371
Potatoes:	Cwt.	
1943	4,367	6,896
1944	5,949	7,504
1945	33,958	38,915
1946	68,981	63,873
1947	8,669	10,229
1948	21,722	29,553
1949	12,529	8,598
Total	156,175	165,568
Prunes:	Tons	
1937	56.1	2,357
1938	22.8	397
1940	91.1	5,383
Total	170.0	8,137
Raisins:	Tons	
1937	22.6	1,245
1938	105.5	2,688
1940	109.2	5,146
Total	237.3	9,079

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Rice:	Cwt.	
1948	153	658
1949	1,865	8,034
1950	217	1,127
1951	4,007	20,914
1952	209	1,088
1953	1,808	8,888
1954	17,552	84,595
1955	15,557	82,404
1956	13,305	69,394
1957	6,977	38,505
1958	8,306	41,087
Total	69,956	356,694
Rye:	Bushels	
1939	1,500	567
1940	4,247	1,619
1941	2,451	1,224
1942	5,244	3,133
1943	132	99
1944	59	44
1945	19	14
1948	755	934
1949	853	1,029
1950	1,240	1,512
1951	500	618
1952	136	181
1953	4,469	6,004
1954	6,121	8,186
1955	10,742	11,348
1956	2,604	3,077
1957	6,599	7,161
1958	8,872	8,980
1959	1	1
Total	56,544	55,731
Seeds, Miscellaneous:	Pounds	
1943	174	20
1944	37,777	2,270
1945	3,689	522
1946	8,035	564
1947	19,396	746
1949	4,013	481
1950	233,554	14,393
1951	20,036	10,686
1952	111,481	30,852
1953	15,073	1,995
Total	453,228	62,529

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Soybeans:	Bushels	
1941	149	154
1942	3,641	5,526
1943	261	480
1944	79	165
1945	32	67
1946	6,456	13,323
1947	3,536	7,251
1948	6,928	15,411
1949	11,222	24,157
1950	14,716	30,668
1951	10,759	26,192
1952	11,671	29,992
1953	30,348	77,781
1954	37,943	82,732
1955	27,490	55,076
1956	59,785	126,158
1957	71,628	146,263
1958	126,509	258,201
Total	423,153	899,597
Sweet Potatoes:	Cwt.	
1943	63	130
1945	9	13
1946	5	7
Total	77	150
Tobacco:	Pounds	
1931-35	69,755	8,635
1937	5,627	934
1938	708	35
1939	18,314	2,731
1940	98,155	13,156
1941	14,998	2,540
1942	10,941	2,443
1943	1,935	532
1944	1,829	529
1945	15,921	6,258
1946	256,278	92,024
1947	289,481	122,812
1948	233,366	108,698
1949	161,648	66,400
1950	139,763	78,524
1951	237,163	131,781
1952	328,762	165,962
1953	255,611	121,232

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Tobacco: (Cont'd.)	Pounds	
1954	338,414	206,914
1955	364,189	248,834
1956	324,169	197,951
1957	136,231	80,088
1958	147,567	94,818
Total	3,450,825	1,753,831
Tung Oil:	Pounds	
1952	7,102	1,882
1953	32,901	7,865
1954	5,085	1,078
1956	21,041	4,419
1957	15,166	3,109
1958	33,874	7,113
Total	115,169	25,466
Wheat:	Bushels	
1938	85,745	49,216
1939	167,702	117,370
1940	278,430	200,629
1941	366,326	361,556
1942	408,136	468,168
1943	130,170	164,293
1944	180,413	249,841
1945	59,680	80,261
1946	21,988	31,788
1947	31,239	57,173
1948	254,027	518,353
1949	335,343	669,215
1950	188,372	375,165
1951	199,538	414,582
1952	398,639	867,746
1953	493,955	1,075,120
1954	401,173	892,645
1955	277,142	568,795
1956	234,888	467,939
1957	223,563	438,246
1958	564,303	1,028,033
1959	25,974	44,720
Total	5,326,746	9,140,854
Whey:	Pounds	
1954	91,439	3,968

(Continued)

LOANS MADE, UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES, BY CROP YEARS
FROM DATE OF ORGANIZATION (1933) THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959 1/

Commodity and Crop Year	Quantity Pledged 1,000 Units	Amount 1,000 Dollars
Wool and Mohair:	Pounds	
1938	83,088	14,916
1939	10,890	1,914
1952	119,090	72,289
1953	47,933	27,141
1954	61,640	34,178
Total	322,641	150,438
Other Loan Programs:		
1942 Fiber Flax Facilities		917
1942 Hempseed & Harvesting Equipment		36
1942 Linseed Oil		1,981
1942 Peanut Equip. & Warehousing		3,643
1943 American-Egyptian Cottonseed		6
1943 Foreign Purchase Facilities		3,387
1943 Raisin Prod. Association		25
1943 War Hemp		28
-Storage Facility and Equipment		118,589
Total		128,612
GRAND TOTAL		30,275,099

1/ Includes loans made directly by Commodity Credit Corporation and loans made by banks and other lending agencies under Commodity Credit Corporation obligations to purchase. Renewals and extensions of loans previously made are excluded.

2/ Partly estimated.

3/ Loans to the Cotton Producers Pool were second lien advance on cotton in the pool. The 1933 advance was $20 per 500-pound bale and the 1934 advance was an additional $10 on cotton remaining in the pool. The number of bales involved is excluded from the quantities placed under loan.

CSS-Fiscal Division
Financial Analysis Branch

United States Department of Agriculture
Office of the Secretary

ADMINISTERING FARM PROGRAMS

True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture
and President, Commodity Credit Corporation

Statements used in addressing the Southeast Area Conference, Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture, West Palm Beach, Florida, - June 15, 1956, 11:00 a.m.

We are engaged in the largest all-out effort in history to aid farmers. Price support and stabilization programs have recently been costing about one billion dollars per year. We are now moving into a Soil Bank program that may cost an additional billion dollars or more.

It places tremendous responsibility on the "grass-roots" organization of farmers -- state, county and township committeemen who administer these programs.

Before a Senate Committee, early this week, I made a restatement of our attitude with respect to the use of State and local committees in carrying out the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Program. We have always recognized, and on many occasions have paid public tribute to, the many splendid contributions to agriculture which the committee system has made.

Our goal has consistently been to make the best possible use of these farmer-elected committees. Today, we are even more firmly convinced of the desirability of having an alert and effective committee system through which to administer "action" farm programs which so directly and vitally affect millions of our American farmers.

Late in May 1953, Secretary Benson announced a change in operating methods to be followed in county ASC offices (then Production and Marketing Administration). Under the policy announced by Secretary Benson, the local policy-formulation and policy-execution functions are separated.

The elected ASC county committees, under the general supervision and direction of the state committees, function as a Board of Directors. They make the policy decisions relative to these phases of the agricultural conservation, price support, and production adjustment programs which are being administered through their offices.

The county office manager carries out the policies determined by the county committee and is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the office. This change recognizes the time-tested principle of the desirability of separating the broad phases of policy-making from the details of executing the policy.

Under this method of operation, the committees are not "advisory". Rather, they have very real and difficult responsibilities for the determination of important decisions such as the formulation of the county ACP programs, the establishment of individual farm acreage allotments, the approval of individual requests for cost-sharing under the agricultural conservation program, etc. We are constantly alert to the need of preventing the assumption of policy-making functions by county office managers.

It is important that it be made plain that even though committeemen are elected, to administer programs assigned them by the law or the Secretary of Agriculture, that does not authorize or sanction mal-administration or violation of the laws regulating farm programs.

State committees, county committees, auditors and administrators who are vigorously and conscientiously enforcing the law and seeking out dishonesty and violations will have the full backing, encouragement and support of the Secretary of Agriculture and all of us associated with the Administration. We are moving into even more costly and extensive programs where the temptation will be even more in the direction of violations of laws and regulations.

Each county committee has the sole responsibility for hiring its county office manager provided he meets the minimum qualifications established for the position. Under delegations from the Secretary minimum qualification standards are prescribed nationally by the Deputy Administrator, Production Adjustment, of the Commodity Stabilization Service. A State Committee has neither the authority to insist upon the employment as office manager of any person not desired by the county committee nor the right to refuse approval of a person selected as manager by a county committee if such person meets the qualification standards. The reverse is likewise true. The county committees can fire as well as hire, within the limits of the regulations.

The county office manager method of operation was not new in most of our county offices at the time it was prescribed for use in all counties. Rather it was the method which had been followed prior to that time in the great majority of the States.

Observation over the years had indicated that those offices in which the county committees did not work full time and which utilized the services of a competent person in directing their day-to-day operations were the most efficiently and effectively operated.

Since this method of operation was adopted nationally, we are convinced that it has permitted more effective attention to policy matters by committeemen. Also, we believe that it has attracted a more representative group of farmers as committeemen because they were not expected to be away from their busy farming operations every day.

Many good farmers do not have the time or the experience required in carrying out the day-to-day tasks of a clerical nature which would be involved if they devoted full time to county office operations. Many good farmers have no desire to have responsibility for clerical details.

We are convinced that since the spring of 1953 the over-all quality and efficiency of operation has increased in county ASC offices. We are confident that this has been brought about by the uniform application of the separation of policy-forming and policy-execution functions in all offices and by other administrative devices which we have inaugurated.

These include, among others, more effective training programs for office managers and employees, increased use of internal auditors, increasing leave privileges and raising salaries to attract and keep the best possible county

office employees, and a persistent insistence on clean, timely, and effective administration at all levels.

The system has worked well.

The Department will continue to rely strongly upon the committee system in carrying out price support and soil bank and other programs. Our every effort is being directed at strengthening and improving the farmer committee system.

Farmer committeemen have been given a special obligation. Neighboring farmers have selected them to represent and serve them in carrying out farm programs. This obligation is both an opportunity and a challenge. They are the last and most important link in the chain of farm program administration.

You who are gathered here today represent one of the most vital forces of the Department of Agriculture operations -- direct, practical administration which reaches the individual farm.

You are all part of a great organization which serves not only farmers and farm families, but also all the people of our great Nation. In fact, your influence extends around the world as we help give leadership in international affairs and extend help and cooperation to friendly countries.

# # #

EXHIBIT L

RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATE ASC COMMITTEEMEN

A talk by H. Laurence Manwaring,
Deputy Administrator, Production Adjustment,
Southwest Area, Commodity Stabilization Service,
U. S. Department of Agriculture
Dallas, Texas, January 19, 1960

I'd like to divide what I have to say about the job of the State ASC Committeemen into four parts: the philosophy back of the committee system, a little of the history of the system, the function and responsibilities of Committeemen, and the results achieved. It is important that you have a good understanding of these things because if you do, you will know more clearly what your responsibility is, what is expected of you, how you fit into the organization, and how you should conduct yourselves in carrying on your committee work.

First, as to the philosophy of the committee system. I am not sure that the legislators who first provided for the committee system really did it with any philosophy in mind. I haven't been able to ascertain that they thought the thing through thoroughly and then decided that this was the best way to go. Some of them were familiar with the use of committees in agricultural activities, such as in the Extension Service. They therefore probably attempted to adapt what they were familiar with to what they knew would have to be done in the administration of these new programs they were putting on the statute books. In doing so, however, they created a new administrative system. They passed into law a requirement that some agricultural programs must be administered through State, county and community committees of farmers. They prescribed the manner in which these people would be selected and then left it largely to the Secretary of Agriculture to direct their activities.

One thing I am sure they did recognize was the need for leadership. They might very well have adopted a straight-line system or some other system, but they did adopt what has come to be known as the committee system, and it has proved to be particularly well adapted to the kind of programs we administer.

The important thing about the committee system is that it permits the people who are affected by the programs to have a part in their administration and, to some extent, in the development of the programs themselves.

At the State level, the programs are administered through State Committeemen, who must be farmers and who are selected by the Secretary of Agriculture. There have been attempts from time to time to change this arrangement and to say that the Secretary should be guided by somebody else in the selection of State Committeemen. Some have gone so far as to indicate that the Secretary should permit County Committeemen

or county representatives to elect the State Committee. We have always resisted that, because it is our feeling that if you are going to have a coordinated and effective administration, you must have a State Committee which has been selected by the Secretary, in which he has complete confidence, and which can be expected to support the policies of the Administration, insofar as they are enacted into law.

So far as the County Committeemen are concerned, the Congress said that inasmuch as some of these programs have a direct effect on farmers, we want them to be administered by County Committeemen who must be farmers, who must reside in the county, and who will be elected by their fellow farmers.

The most important thing that has developed out of the committee system is that it has permitted local adaptation of programs to particular areas, so far as we have been able to leave matters to the judgment of our State and County committees. This is a vast country. We have divergent conditions--they are just as divergent as you could possibly find. This is true of the nature of the land, the crops, the background of the people--even their ancestors get mixed up in it because by heritage they do things a little differently in some places than in others.

I was in Utah several years ago and the boys in the State Office took me out to see some of the Agriculture Conservation Program practices, some of the things they were very, very proud of having accomplished. We went out where they had lined an irrigation ditch. This ditch went across a gravely patch of land where they had been losing a large amount of the water. They were very proud of the fact that by virtue of having lined that ditch they were saving a considerable amount of this lifeblood of agriculture in that area. But in some other parts of this great country the problem is to get that same water off the land as easily as you can with as little damage as you can and get it on down the river. And so you have differences in the application of the Agricultural Conservation Program. Our objective is to permit local adaptation just as far as possible to help solve important agricultural problems.

You also have need for adaptation in the use of reserves made available under the acreage allotment programs. Sometimes we have thought we had abuse of this, but when we got down to the actual utilization of the reserves, we found that the committee had a reason and by and large they convinced us that they had a good reason for allocating those reserves as they did.

So the programs require local adaptation. This means exercise of judgment, and there we sometimes run into trouble. From time to time a committee may use poor judgment and then the auditors come along and say: Look what these foolish people did. You've got this too wide open. You've got to plug this loophole. Then in an attempt to plug the loophole, we take away from all of the rest of you the exercise of judgment

and adaptation that you ought to have. We're constantly fighting that and attempting to keep from doing it. We know that we should not try to make in Washington the decisions that ought to be made by you people out in the States. And yet I recognize as plainly as anything that from day to day we are taking away the power of adaptation that was given to you.

Another thing that has happened under the committee system has been that by using farmers at the State level and the county level who are not required to give their full time, we have obtained an independence of thinking which we would not have had otherwise. We get people to say what they think. If we ever get in the position where we shut off the exercise of this independence of thought and speech, through proper channels, then we are going to deprive ourselves of some of the finest thinking and best judgment that there is to be had.

Years ago somebody thought of the idea of putting the Chairman of the State Committee on a full-time appointment. I remember going to a meeting in the Southeast Area which was attended by the Chairmen of all the committees and many others. At that meeting, one of the Chairmen made the statement that he objected strenuously to what we were proposing. He said, when you put me on a full-time job and I have the feeling that if I don't tell you what I think you want to know, I'll be fired, then you have taken away from me the power to use my independent judgment and to tell you what I think. And so this independence gives you an opportunity to say what you think.

Now, there is a channel through which that should be done. If you are a part of an administrative organization, then you speak your piece within that organization and attempt to get your thoughts listened to and your ideas accepted if you can, but you don't go outside and shout all over the country and break up your organization. This is no more than what you would want in a business of your own.

Let's go back to history just a minute. The philosophy I have spoken of I think has evolved over the years. I don't think it existed at the time the committee system was adopted. Prior to 1936 the program was administered by the Extension Service through its existing organization. Many of the people who participated in this program in the early days were Extension people who transferred over. The present Secretary of Agriculture participated in the administration of these programs as an Extension worker in Idaho in the very beginning. They used committees or they selected persons to take the lead in the administration of the programs at that time. This was a little prior to the enactment of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which required the election of committees. I well remember one of the first meetings I ever attended in the Northeast when the persons who were acting as administrators of the program--and all of them at that time were connected with Extension--met to protest the requirement that County Committeemen must be elected. They

said, you can't rely on elected committeemen to administer a program. If you let us select them, we'll get the best farmers in the county and then you'll have program administration you can be proud of, but if you let them elect anybody they want to, we just can't be responsible. It finally took a visit by the Administrator, and I believe he was also Under Secretary at that time, to tell them, well, gentlemen, there isn't any alternative. It is required by law, so go out and do it, and let's do the very best we can.

At that time we were divided into regions. Because there was a certain amount of autonomy in each of the regions, we developed a little different organization and a little different manner in which to administer programs. By and large, we adopted two different types of organization and administration. In the North Central Region, we developed a system of administration in which the State and County Committee worked full time. In most of the other regions, the committees worked as a board of directors. In other words, they had a part-time job and administered the program to a large extent through what they called a State Executive Secretary or Secretary to the County Committee--I have forgotten all of the titles that were used.

When the present Secretary of Agriculture took office, he asked that a considerable amount of work be done in bringing together our experience with respect to all of these different types of organization. We called on people from different areas to give us their experience to see if we could develop out of all this a type of organization which was perhaps a little superior to the others. And we developed the present system, which requires that each State Committee and each County Committee be a board of directors, and that they employ for the day-to-day operation in the State and County Offices a State Administrative Officer and a County Office Manager. Each one of these committeemen must be on a part-time basis and paid for the days he works. And then we said to the State and County Committees, we would now like you to be the board of directors, we want you to make the policy, and then let your State Administrative Officer or County Office Manager carry out the policy under your direction and guidance. And so under the present system in all States the committees act as boards of directors. We have adopted nationally a plan growing out of the background and history of committee operations.

As you know, there is a variation in the number of days that the State Committeemen work. You may hear that in Iowa or in Illinois or in some of those States they work two days a week. You may hear that in the Northeast, in some areas where perhaps they have only an Agriculture Conservation Program and a Conservation Reserve Program, they meet one day a month. You may have different days for meetings. This is worked out between yourselves and the Area Director, based on the work load and what needs to be done within each State.

At the State level, we adopted one other inovation with which we had had some experience, and that is the rotation system. I want to talk just a minute about that, because you will want to understand why we did it. We had tried this plan in the Northeast, in Vermont, in Connecticut, and in one or two other States. This was on the basis of a five-man committee and a five year tour of duty. We found that we built up over a period of years a group of men who had gone off the committee feeling good about it, feeling that they had made a contribution. We found that we brought onto the committee new blood, new thinking, new ideas. We found that we brought onto the committee men of stature, men who could not be expected to spend full time on this job, but who were willing to take enough time from their busy duties to come and give us guidance in the operation of these programs. And therefore we felt that we obtained on these committees men of a little higher caliber than we otherwise would. I distinctly remember our experience with the full-time system where we had some committeemen who disposed of their farming operations and who stayed on so long that they were of no value to the State.

These experiences led us to conclude that we would have better committeemen if we adopted a rotation system so that a man who went on the committee knew when he went on that he would be asked to spend, say, four and a half years and no more, to contribute to the program, and then retire from the committee and go back to his farming operation.

We attempted to adopt a rotation system at the county level, but the Congress said we don't agree with that and they passed legislation which prohibited our doing it. We have recommended several times that a rotation plan be adopted at the county level, at least in modified form. The modification we recommended most recently was that farmers be elected for staggered three-year terms so that we would have only one man going off a committee in any one year instead of three as we sometimes have now. This, we felt, would give continuity to the committee's work and would give some protection to County Office Managers who had done a good job. We have never been able to get this system. We don't know if we will or not.

Now, a little bit about the functioning of the committee system. As I indicated before, the purpose of the committee system is to administer the programs. I think in the early days of these programs and the early days of the committee system, we did fall into misconceptions of our responsibilities and we ran ourselves into trouble. Some of our committees considered themselves to be the spokesman for agriculture in their county or in their State. As such, they usurped, to a degree, the function of a farm organization. They began to get into the hair of the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers' Union and even the Extension Service because they presumed not only to administer programs but to formulate and press for particular things in the farm programs.

The Assistant Secretary told you this morning some directions in which the Administration would like to go. Up to the present time, some of them have not been accomplished, and so you may be administering programs as State Committeemen that the Secretary does not agree with and that you do not agree with. And yet you are required to administer them because they are on the books, and to do so in the very best way you know how. They were put there originally for a purpose. You are expected as Committeemen to help accomplish their purpose. It is our job to do our utmost in administering these programs fairly. We have allotment programs that are hard to carry out--no farmer likes to have half as much acreage in cotton as he would like to grow, no farmer likes to have two-thirds as much wheat as he would like to grow. They would like to be free to choose what they will grow and how they will grow it. And yet, the objective of the allotment program was to attempt to control production, to get it in line with demand. We still have the law on the books, and it is our job to see if we can attain that objective. And in doing so, it is our responsibility to be just as fair and as objective as we can possibly be with farmers who are required to function under these allotment programs.

I am very much concerned sometimes because once in a while--not often--we get charges that in some counties the committeemen are administering these programs for their own benefit and are not objective and fair, and are not running these programs equitably. We ought to watch this very carefully. Through your State Offices you ought to be sure to look into this matter and to get the job done just as objectively as you possibly can.

Our job is administration, it is not to press for other types of programs. I want to make this very clear. The Assistant Secretary could have come here and said to you today, now, boys, we are here all by ourselves. There aren't any outsiders here and what I want you boys to do is to go back and do everything you can to see that what we want is done. And about the first time it became obvious that we were putting on a campaign, the farm organizations would start to look into the matter and wonder what is happening here and where you folks are going. So we ought to be mighty careful how we use our positions.

As the State Committee, you have certain rights and responsibilities. One of those is to determine policy and to be sure your policy is carried out. Those policies, of course, must be made within national procedures. If you don't stay within the procedures, you are bound to get in trouble. So we have recommended to you from time to time that you carefully keep a record of the minutes of your State Committee meetings, and that they be clear but concise, telling your State Administrative Officer what you want done. Then you should check back over the minutes again to be sure that what you decided has been done. In other words, you are the board of directors. The State Administrative Officer works for you, you do not work for him. I want to make that abundantly clear.

I also want to make abundantly clear that the day you start usurping the State Administrative Officer's responsibility and begin going down in behind him and directing his personnel in what they should do, you are going to create chaos in your State Office and you are going to make it difficult, if not impossible, for him to do a good job for you. And so you have a responsibility both ways, to direct his efforts but to stay out of his job. If you think he isn't doing it right, then consult with him, but let him supervise his own people. We have had more trouble, I think, from State Committees attempting to run the operations under the State Administrative Officer than almost anything else I can think of.

We have asked State Committees and State Offices to supervise the work of County Committees and County Offices. We do not go direct to the County Offices, we try hard not to give them any directions of any kind. We send instructions through your office and you direct their activity. And we have tried hard not to let County Committeemen or county office employees come back up direct to us--they must come to the State Committee. We have tried not to usurp your authority. If, however, a County Committeeman or county office employee feels he has been wronged and after he has appealed to the State Committee and given any additional information, we have permitted him to appeal to Washington to see whether we can substantiate what has been done. And we have asked you to let us know as you go along what action you have taken.

Finally, we have asked you, if need be, to handle the tough problems. We've had some cases where a County Committee has done its best to handle a particular problem with a particular farmer, the County Office Manager has helped, the State Administrative Officer has done everything he could do, and then they have appealed to the State Committee and said: We have gone as far as we can go. Won't you, as the State Committee, call this man in--or it may in some cases be a County Committee--and give us help. These are the tough ones, these are the mean ones, and you have gone ahead and handled them.

There is one other function which the committee system fulfills. It's extremely important, and this is one that I have a little feeling we aren't doing as well with as we should. That is to reflect suggestions for change back to the Secretary through the Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service. The Assistant Secretary invited suggestions this morning and I want to emphasize what he said, because it is only through the experience you people have that we can know whether we are doing the job right or not. Some of us once worked out in the country but that was some time ago. When you have been away from the farm a little while, you have a tendency to lose contact with developments and to remember only what happened when you were there. You ought to be conscious, and your County Committeemen should also, of the necessity to reflect up through channels to the Secretary changes that you think ought to be made in operations and in policy.

I have never known a time when the people in the Secretary's Office were not willing to listen. I certainly have known times when they did not and could not adopt your suggestions. Sometimes it takes a while to get to a point in time when we can do these things. I have seen suggestions made one year which were not adopted for several years, because we were just not quite up to that point in our thinking and in our operations. So don't be discouraged. We do want your suggestions, but we have to take into consideration the interaction and effect of a proposed change on other areas of the country and on other commodities, as well as your commodity and your part of the country.

Over a period of years we have had complaints from a number of our Congressional delegations that they didn't know what was going on with respect to our programs. As you know, there is a prohibition in the Appropriation Act which says no part of these funds shall be used to influence legislation. I am not talking about an attempt to influence legislation, but rather about the Congressmen knowing the facts about what is happening in these programs--how many allotments do you have, how many Soil Bank contracts, how many price support loans, and so on. Some State Offices have adopted the system of making a report on their activities and giving the Congressmen and the Senators a copy of the report. This is a good thing to do, but I want to stress that I am talking about a factual report and not about influence, and we must not be in that business in any way. But I do feel that many Congressmen from agricultural districts do not know what is going on with respect to our programs and do not know what problems are being faced. You can tell them what is going on.

Now, let me talk just a minute about results. We think that the committee system, as such--and perhaps this is a by-product--has attracted and developed outstanding leaders in agriculture in this county. You have an example of that in the case of Assistant Secretary Marvin McLain. He started in the program in the beginning. I have seen a good many people who came on a State Committee and gave their time to it, and who after leaving the committee continued their interest and went on to do other things and to become leaders in agriculture. So, as a by-product, I think we have developed a large number of outstanding leaders.

Under our agricultural programs there has been an upsurge of interest in conservation and adoption of practices far beyond those for which we have made payments. This is as it should be. We ought to get out of it more than just the money that is put in it. The Agricultural Conservation Program has been the little bit of leaven that has caused a number of farmers to adopt and to carry into operation some of the plans they have under soil conservation districts and some of the plans under the Great Plains Program and others.

Now, I think it's our job to make sure that we get even more than we have before for whatever is made available to us by the Congress. This is one area we ought to watch very closely, and at the same time adapt it to the conditions within our own particular area and to see that we get out of it conservation and not merely an increase in production of crops. We have a responsibility under production controls--and I think this has worked fairly well--to be fair, to do our best to get control out of the programs that we administer, and to see, through your County Committees and through your County Offices, that farmers know beforehand what the restrictions are.

We've had some changes in legislations recently and we've tried to provide you with the means of informing farmers of those changes. I have noted some instances where our State Committees and County Committees have not followed through and the farmer has not known what the changes were. We have an obligation, if we're going to say to him, you've got to control your acreage and thus your production and we are changing the rules on you, he has a right to know what the rule is, and I think we ought to watch that very, very carefully.

One other result of the committee system has been to provide what I will call moral administration. We have a few instances of maladministration, a few instances of fraud. We have a few instances of poor efficiency. But by and large, considering the fact that we have about 9,000 county committeemen scattered over the country, and many more employees than that at the county level, they have done a wonderful job. What I'd like to see--and this would be perfection--is the elimination of the few instances we do have--of the few cases of fraud, of the few cases of maladministration, and this will be done so far as you people get your State Offices to direct carefully the activities at the county level. We have, I think, very high efficiency at the State and county level in our organization. We are trying hard to train our people and provide training that will make them even more efficient. If we should become less moral, less efficient, and get the feeling among our committeemen that they are there for the purpose of gleaning for themselves the benefits of the program, the committee system will go down the drain and we can kiss it goodbye. We don't want that to happen and we don't expect it to happen.

At one time we had a little rash of attempts to run the programs on a somewhat political basis. We had nothing but trouble and resentment on the part of the County Committeemen from those attempts. What I'm talking about was an attempt to force into a particular County Office persons of a particular political persuasion selected by the State Committee. This was contrary to the spirit and the intent of the committee system, and I know that our leaders in the Department of Agriculture did not condone it and do not now. And so I urge you to watch the Secretary's regulations carefully--they are written as objectively as they could be--and I think they will lead you along some of these paths without getting into marshes on the side and help us get the best administration of these programs that is possible.

You are the leaders in our State organization and you are going to have to exercise the characteristics of leadership. You can't drive in this committee system. You are going to have to lead. The County Committeemen are elected, they are not appointed by you. They can be removed by you for cause, but not just at your will. This is a somewhat unusual arrangement, and it means that you are going to have to exercise outstanding leadership. But this arrangement is not peculiar to the present concept of good organization and administration in industry. Men in industry have come to recognize that they must lead. One of the most outstanding leaders in a national commercial organization made the statement that in his position he did not direct; the only thing he had was protection against somebody else directing him. But to get the work done below his level, he had to lead. This is recognized--that people have rights, that you can't go out and just tell them off. You have to make people feel that they are a part of the organization. Some one has said that the character and qualifications of the leader are reflected in the men he selects, develops, and gathers around him. Show me the leader and I will know his men. Show me the men and I will know their leader. Therefore, to have loyal, efficient and enthusiastic employees, you must be a loyal, efficient, and enthusiastic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GRASSROOTS ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, 25 years ago, in the dark days of the great depression, a unique system of administering Federal farm programs was born. I refer to the elected county and community committee system, which was first provided for in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. Since that time the committee system has assisted in developing and administering Federal farm programs which have been passed by the Congress to cope with the many problems facing agriculture. The committee system has been a success. It has handled billions of dollars with a loss due to dishonesty and maladministration considerably less than the losses experienced by our banking system.

I know the Members of this Senate are acquainted with many of the community and county committeemen elected in their States by their fellow farmers as well as with the State committeemen which are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

During the depression days the corn-hog committees not only assisted in administering that program, but they gave the Congress and the U.S. Department of Agriculture wise counsel as to changes which should be made in those early adjustment programs to make them better meet the problems facing the corn-hog farmers.

The legislative origin of the committee system goes back to the original Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. This type of committee administration under this act was permissive, and the committees were generally used to accept contracts, to reduce crop acreage, make farm allotments and measure cropland. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in 1936 directed the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the services of local, county, and State committeemen in carrying out the provisions of that act. There are approximately 99,000 committeemen elected to administer the Federal farm programs which the Congress enacts and gives to the Department of Agriculture to administer. As I have said before, they are elected by their neighbors and are recognized leaders in their local communities. Two of our present Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture have come up through the committee system. They are Marvin L. McLain and Clarence L. Miller.

One great contribution these committeemen have made is to provide a judgment factor without which these rather complex programs would have fallen of their own weight. It would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to set up a bureaucratic straight line organization to administer the programs without the good sound judgment of farmers who are dealing every day on their own farms with the problems to be solved. Their neighbors have confidence in their judgment and have accepted controls with much less protest than would have been the case had not these committeemen been active in support of the programs.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the present committeemen who are serving their country in administering the rather complicated programs which we entrust to them. Not only to those who are now active but to all those committeemen of the past who have given of their time do we owe a vote of gratitude.

Not only have they served to administer the crop adjustment and the agricultural conservation program but during World War II and the Korean affair these men were agricultural leaders who assisted in administering the wartime activities of the Department of Agriculture. The local offices became centers of information for producers, encouraging them to increase production to meet production goals. They also assisted farmers to obtain the necessary supplies to carry on production. They rationed tires, gasoline, farm machinery, and made other very effective contributions to the war effort. State, county, and community committeemen played a vital role in a host of emergency measures ranging from the distribution of vital information to the rationing of supplies and promoting war bond drives in rural communities.

The committee system was chiefly responsible for the success of the corn-for-war program in 1944. Their patriotic appeal to their fellow farmers for delivery of corn closed a dangerous gap in corn deliveries.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I could go on pointing out other examples of the excellent job which these elected county and community committeemen and the appointed State committeemen have made over the years.

At this time, when criticism seems to be the order of the day, I am taking the privilege of commending our farm committeemen for a job well done.

THE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday, June 9, a 20-page section concerning the coal industry was published in the Washington Daily News. This section deals with many different aspects of this great industry—its technological advances, its potential in the production of electric power, its usefulness to the steel industry, its numerous byproducts, and its part in the defense of this country.

Several persons closely associated with the coal industry contributed articles for publication in this newspaper feature. Among them were Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the vice president of Southern Railway, W. Mason King.

The remarks by the contributors point up the tremendous potential and advances of coal. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 9, 1960]

NEW BUILDING OPENS TODAY—FUTURE OF COAL IS NOT BLACK

(By Stephen F. Dunn)

The new Coal Building represents an industry about which the average resident of Washington knows very little.

In years gone by, Washingtonians were very much aware of the importance of coal to the Nation's economy and security. In the early days of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, which wa sopened in 1850, much of its freight was coal from the mines near Cumberland. Coal also made extension of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad from Washington to the producing districts of West Virginia and Pennsylvania economically feasible. And it was primarily responsible for the construction of other rail lines from coalfields into the Nation's capital.

EARLY USES

Not so many years ago bituminous coal and anthracite were the predominant fuels used for home heating in this area. Coal's vital role in an emergency was brought vividly to the attention of local residents in 1917. President Wilson motivated by sharply increasing energy requirements in the manufacture and transportation of military equipment and supplies, set up a Fuels Administration soon after America entered World War I. The Nation's coal producers were immediately mobilized. The outcome of this call was formation of the National Coal Association.

Again in World War II the people of Washington—and the Nation in general—had an opportunity to become acquainted with the importance of coal to the country's defense structure. When oil shipping moving from the Gulf of Mexico into New York and New England was interrupted by submarine action, the White House appealed to industry and homeowners alike to convert to coal wherever possible. From 1938, the year of the Munich Pact, until 1944, when Allied forces landed on the Continent, coal requirements increased by 75 percent.

In recent years, with the broad extension of natural gas service, comparatively few householders in the Washington area have been direct consumers of bituminous coal. Actually, however, shipments of this fuel into the District and environs are increasing steadily. The Potomac Electric Power Co. will use about three-quarters of a million tons of bituminous coal this year. The central heating plant, which is south of the Agriculture Department and provides heat for most of the downtown Government buildings, uses as much as 1,000 tons of coal a day in cold weather. Consumption of bituminous coal for electric power generation in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia is now in excess of 9 million tons annually. By 1965 this figure will rise to 14 million tons.

INDIRECT BUYERS

Washingtonians are also the coal industry's indirect customers because so much coal goes into the manufacture of steel for automobiles, and other consumer products. Coal is used in the production of cement for highways and building materials. Coal chemicals are the base of medicines, perfumes, nylons, fertilizers, and a thousand-and-one other items.

Of urgent importance to all Americans is the ability of the coal industry to maintain the capacity that would be needed in another emergency. Last year the White House imposed a quota restriction on residual oil imports because of the impact these imports were having on the coal industry. The order

Northeast Area
May 1961

GRASSROOTS ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

(Highlights in the History of the Committee System)

Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933

Origin of the committee system. Production controls established for seven basic crops: wheat, cotton, corn, hogs, rice, tobacco, and milk. Local committees took applications for crop reduction contracts, adjusted farm allotments, measured acreage, and many other functions. Committees operated under guidance of the Extension Service.

Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936

This act directed Secretary of Agriculture to utilize services of local and State committees. It provided for election of county and community committees by farmers and appointment by the Secretary of State committee members.

Committees set crop allotments, determined soil depleting and soil conserving bases, measured acreage, certified applications for conservation payments.

In 1936 and 1937, committees processed $151,523,000 in conservation practice funds.

Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

Additional responsibility placed on committee system. Committees administered acreage allotment, marketing quotas, and price support activity at the local level on "basic" crops: corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.

Committee War-Time Activity - 1942-1946

Committees played vital role in food production for war effort. Committeemen were responsible for commodity loan programs, production payments for fluid milk, beef, lamb, and sheep; served on county war boards, were instrumental in allocating farm machinery and allocating supplies.

Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949

Under these two acts committees were engaged in price support activity on both basic and non-basic commodities. During the period 1947 to 1950 a total of $4,942,457,000 in price support loans on 19 commodities weresuccessfully handled through the committee system.

Wool Act of 1954 and Soil Bank Act of 1956

Under the Wool Act committees receive and approve applications for wool incentive payments. The Soil Bank Act of 1956 directed the Secretary to utilize the services of committeemen to administer the act at the local level. Committeemen approved contracts, set annual practice and payment rates, established policy on weed control, and acted on violation and termination matters.

1961 Feed Grain Program and the President's Farm Message

Additional responsibility placed on committee system to spearhead successful operation of emergency feed grain legislation. President's farm message reaffirms reliance on committee system as most effective tool in local administration of Federal farm programs; requests revitalization of the system.